PHD

The Fantasy of Neoliberalism

Discursive Representations of the Left's Submission to Contemporary Capitalist Ideology

Bennett, Stuart

Award date:
2020

Awarding institution:
University of Bath

The Fantasy of Neoliberalism: Discursive Representations of the Left's Submission to Contemporary Capitalist Ideology

Stuart Bennett

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Bath

Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies

August 2019

Copyright Notice

Declaration of Any Previous Submission of the Work

The material presented here for examination for the award of a higher degree by research has not been incorporated into a submission for another degree

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support, care and generosity of the following people:

First and foremost, my fiancée Sarah Walker, who has been so supportive throughout this all-encompassing PhD process. Thank you for putting up with nearly four years of highs and lows, successes and failures, and boundless stress. I couldn't have done it without you.

Much gratitude also goes to my parents. They have not only supported me financially through this process, but emotionally and intellectually also. Ever since my school days they have encouraged me to pursue my intellectual passions, and this project would not have been possible without them.

This project also owes a debt of gratitude to my stellar supervisory team, Drs Juan Pablo Ferrero (lead) and David Moon (secondary). They have pushed my intellectual capacity to its limits, exposing me to new ways of thinking about politics and economics. They have dedicated countless hours to making sure I produced this work to the best of my abilities. A particular recognition must be made of Dr Ferrero who graciously agreed to facilitate my transfer to the University of Bath from the University of Bristol midway through the first year of this project as my research interests changed dramatically. Thank you for taking that chance. An acknowledgement also of my original supervisory team at the University of Bristol, Dr Joanna Crow and Professor Matthew Brown. While my research quickly moved away from its original premise, and thus your areas of expertise, I thank you also for taking a chance on me and showing faith in my potential as a researcher. It must never be forgotten that this project started with you. Finally, a thank you to my viva examiners Professor Brad Evans and Dr Heiko Feldner. The viva was, rather unexpectedly, an enthralling experience of intellectual debate. Your suggestions for minor revisions have made this thesis all the stronger.

To my fellow PhD colleagues and friends at the Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies (PoLIS) who have been another crucial source of support. There are too many to name here, but I thank each and every one of you for your displays of solidarity and camaraderie. Similarly, thank you to my friends outside of PoLIS. Having people outside academia has provided me with a necessary ability to escape and turn off the stresses that come with doctoral study.

Finally, this project would not have been possible without the assistance of the tireless staff that work at the archives I visited throughout this research project. The work you do maintaining these crucial repositories of information and political history cannot be overstated. Special recognition must go to the volunteer staff at the Marx Memorial Library in London, whose personal stories serve as a constant reminder of the importance of studying and keeping alive working-class political history and experiences.

Abstract

Slavoj Žižek's critique of ideology has come to be one of the most influential yet controversial interventions in contemporary critical theory. Žižek's existing work, which draws from fields as varied as cultural studies, philosophy and politics, and is combined with his own interpretation of Lacanian psychoanalysis, opens up novel spaces into which new critical evaluations of contemporary capitalism can enter.

This research project conceptualises contemporary capitalism, identified as "neoliberalism", as an ideology, a structural edifice constituted and maintained by fantasy that has material effects on governance, policy and institutions, as well as effects on subjectivity. This project therefore brings together existing scholarly critiques of neoliberalism that have often been seen as conflicting by mediating said perspectives through Žižek's Lacanian-founded critique of ideology.

Going back to the foundational moment of the neoliberal turn – the Pinochet-led military junta in Chile – this project explores the ideology-function of neoliberalism and the concurrent failure to successfully contest this ideology by analysing left-wing coverage of the 'Milagro de Chile' in Britain. This is achieved by operationalising Žižek's ideology thesis, something yet to be done with concrete purpose, as a critical discourse analysis through which left-wing anti-capitalist newspaper and journal articles covering the Chilean experience are studied. Through this discourse analysis it is found that said left-wing coverage changes substantially as the neoliberal turn is instituted and concretised first in Chile and subsequently in the United Kingdom. Left-wing discourse falls quickly into line with neoliberal ideological tropes, evidencing a succumbing of the Left to neoliberal fantasy, and the totalising nature of contemporary capitalist ideology.

This thesis uncovers the function of neoliberal ideology as being that of radical depoliticization of the social sphere and the individualisation and compartmentalisation of the political subject. These processes reflect a subconscious fantasy that ascribes "politics" as the barrier to enjoyment, and as the root cause of ontological insecurity experienced by all subjects. Neoliberalism functions by changing entirely the frames through which political, economic and social issues are conceptualised and discussed, rendering established structuralist critiques of capitalism insufficient. This thesis thus offers a new insight into the foundations of contemporary capitalism – one that is built upon nullifying critique.

List of Abbreviations

CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis

CIA – Central Intelligence Agency

CPE – Critical Political Economy

CPGB – Communist Party of Great Britain

CUT – Central Única de Trabajadores

FI – Fourth International

PCCh – Partido Comunista de Chile

PDC – Partido Demócrata Cristiana

PN – Partido Nacional

PS – Partido Socialista

IMG – International Marxist Group

IS/SWP – International Socialists/Socialist Workers Party

ISAs – Ideological State Apparatuses

ITN – Independent Television News

MIR – Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria

MLN – Modern Language Notes

NUM – National Union of Mineworkers

PDT – Political Discourse Theory

RCG – Revolutionary Communist Group

RPA – Rhetorical Political Analysis

RSA – Repressive State Apparatus

UK – United Kingdom

UP – Unidad Popular

US / USA – United States / United States of America

Introduction

i. Why (continue to) study neoliberalism? The ravages of contemporary capitalism

The ravages of contemporary capitalism (referred to as 'neoliberalism' in this thesis) are well known to those involved in its critique. In the name of free markets and privatisation, communities in the Global North have been decimated as work has been shipped out to those parts of the world where labour is cheaper, and regulations are less stringent. The shipyards of the west of Scotland, Belfast and Liverpool have been shut, making whole communities unemployed. Riveting and welding have been replaced by drug addiction, alcoholism and destitution (Baruffati et al 2020). The recipients of those jobs are communities in the Global South, where labour is cheaper and, it would appear, more expendable. At the world's largest ship-breaking yard, in Chittagong, Bangladesh, thousands of workers (many of whom are children) are paid less than £1 a day to dismantle the ships of some of the largest shipping companies in the world. Labour regulations are slack and deaths and life-changing injuries are a regular occurrence (Vidal 2nd December 2017; Hussain 25th December 2019).

One of the most pressing issues related to the neoliberal project is the increase in inequality, both on a national and global scale. The rollback of the state and proliferation of finance capital has led to an unprecedented concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, whereby the richest 1% of people on this planet own a total of 45% of the world's wealth (inequality.org n.d.). There is a barbarity to this inequality. When it was discovered that workers at a factory that manufactures iPhones were resorting to jumping off the factory's roof rather than continue to face their appalling working conditions and poverty wages, the factory's owners Foxconn (a subcontractor for Apple) installed nets around the factory's roof to catch jumping workers (Merchant 18th June 2017). When this story came to light in 2010, Apple made $4.31 billion in net profits in the final quarter of that year, a record quarter for the company at the time (apple.com 18th October 2010). The inhumanity of capitalism is not new, but the stark paradox of a world of unprecedented plenty and continual abuses of human life makes this inhumanity all the more perverse.

The neoliberal obsession with privatisation has led to a private sector takeover of aspects of life that were once the preserve of the state. Goods and services once considered too sacred and too important for the daily existence of the individual have been handed over to corporations whose first and only priority is the balance sheet. This, of course, has had devastating effects on people's lives. In 2014, the financially stricken city of Flint, Michigan sought to reduce the cost of supplying water to residents by sourcing water from the nearby Flint River, rather than purchasing water from Lake Huron, which is controlled by the city of Detroit. In 2015, water service management was contracted out to private corporation Veolia, which promised the cash-strapped city a further reduction in costs. While the company came good on its promise, it achieved this in part by using substandard water treatment chemicals and procedures. The combination of a city being forced to live by extremely tight budgetary restrictions and a private company relentlessly pursuing the bottom line has meant that the city of Flint and surrounding towns and villages have been exposed to dangerously high volumes of lead in the water supply (caused by old corroded pipes in the Flint River). This has put thousands of residents at risk of lead poisoning and has been culpable for at least 12

deaths (Lerner and Hosea 20th May 2018; Bellware 12th September 2019; Holden et al 10th December 2019). The crisis has still not been resolved.

In 2008, the UK government contracted its work capability assessment procedure to the private company Atos. In an effort to get people off the state's benefits bill, Atos was found to be putting people with long term health problems back to work and denying them government assistance in lieu of wages. Such was the bad PR from the relentless campaigning by disability rights activists, that Atos bought itself out of its contract early and was replaced by another private firm, Maximus in 2014 (Siddique 27th March 2014). Sadly, the shameful practice continues and in 2019 the government was forced into admitting that about 1,600 working-age disabled people had died every year since 2013 as a result of being put back to work (Pring 7th February 2019). Needless to say, the issue has still not been resolved. This is not the only story of privatisation directly causing the deaths of innocent people in the UK. In 2017, 72 people died when a residential tower block caught fire in west London. It has since transpired that when the building had been renovated in 2009, the private company in charge of the renovation covered the building in flammable cladding. The building's renovation was subcontracted out by the local government council, which approved the use of flammable cladding in the name of cost reduction (Booth 13th July 2017). The rollback of the state and the courting of private corporations is having a devastating impact on people's lives.

Since the 1980s, wages in the West have stagnated, while the cost of living has exploded. People are on average working longer hours for less pay. Class mobility – the ability to improve one's own material condition through work – has collapsed, and those born since 1980 are all together worse off financially than previous generations. This is the first time that this has happened since the turn of the 20th century (Edwards 13th February 2017; O'Connor February 23rd, 2018). The neoliberal turn is not just having a physical toll, but it is impacting people's mental health also. In the UK, talk of a 'mental health crisis' is finally surfacing in public discourse, as the suicide rate reached a 16-year high in 2019 (Bulman 3rd September 2019). Experts continue to draw links between the mental health crisis and features of contemporary life, including ever-increasing levels of personal debt, stagnant wages and stress in the workplace (Gathergood 2012; Pasca and Wagner 2012; O'Hara 2017). All the while, mental health services (as with all facets of public spending) continue to be slashed in the name of efficiency savings. One cannot escape the feeling that the popular campaign slogan 'It's OK Not to Feel OK' is aimed more at hegemonising rather than de-stigmatising and bringing attention to mental health issues: "it is now expected that you struggle with mental health, this is the new normal."

It bears repeating that these issues are not unique to contemporary capitalism, but they have certainly been exacerbated by the neoliberal project. This can in part be put down in part to the ever-dwindling ability of workers to win concessions that mediate the full-frontal attacks from the capitalist system. The Reagan and Thatcher administrations in the US and UK respectively – the two regimes perhaps most associated with the word 'neoliberalism' – were characterised by their all-out assault on trade unionism. Draconian measures on trade union operations combined with the proliferation of casualised working patterns have seen trade union membership collapse in recent decades in the UK, and the story is similar in the US (Topping 1st June 2017; Dromey 1st June 2018; Kopf 5th February 2019). With workers now finding it harder to defend the meagre concessions previous generations won through

collective bargaining, such as healthcare provision, health and safety regulations, pensions and so on, the neoliberal drive to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few at the expense of the many has been made that much easier.

We are now also combatting a new battle – that of the impending climate catastrophe. If our working lives and mental health do not finish us off, this crisis certainly will. Popular consciousness has only recently started to awaken to the climate disaster, yet there has been little effort to front up to the inevitable death of the planet. Rainforests continue to be razed for industrial agriculture, oceans and riverways continue to be dumping grounds for pollutants such as oil, plastics and other waste, and the fossil fuel sector's expansion continues unabated (Connor 12th Feburary 2015; Harvey 12th September 2019; Worland 4th November 2019). Even the meagre attempts at addressing climate catastrophe have a particular neoliberal hue. The US and the EU have both introduced 'cap and trade' schemes, whereby permits that allow a certain amount of pollution can be traded between polluting firms. So totalising is the nature of contemporary capitalism that even the air we breathe has been privatised.

Rosa Luxemburg's famed proclamation of 'socialism or barbarism' seems all the more prescient today, and yet it seems that we continue to choose barbarism. Following the first governments of the neoliberal turn in the 1980s, Left parties acquiesced to neoliberalism rather than confront it. In the UK, Tony Blair's stewardship of the Labour Party saw the continuation, not reversal, of Thatcher's privatisation and assault on trade unionism (Gray 2004). The same can be said of Bill Clinton's continuation of Reaganism in the US, of Gerhard Schröder maintaining the course set by his right-wing predecessor Helmut Kohl in Germany, and of many other Left parties that succeeded right-wing neoliberal governments in the 1990s and early 2000s (Meeropol 1998; Braunthal 1999; Mudge 2011). Even after the 2008 financial crisis kicked off one of the worst global economic downturns in history, there has been no great challenge to capitalism from below. Even the clamour for reform has achieved little. The Occupy Movement, for example, fizzled out with a whimper. Those movements that have managed to propel themselves into mainstream politics still have not found themselves in power with overwhelming popular support. The Corbyn leadership of the Labour Party, though popular amongst members, led the party to two successive electoral defeats in 2017 and 2019 against a widely unpopular Conservative Party. Spanish left-wing party Podemos has seen its electoral support nearly half over five elections between 2011 and 2019, despite its initial popularity at the start of the decade. Bernie Sanders' bid to win the Democratic nomination for the Presidency failed in 2016, and the victor Hillary Clinton suffered a shock defeat at the polls to the deeply unpopular Donald Trump. The story is a familiar one across the world. In the aftermath of a crippling economic recession, and in the face of ever-tighter household budgets, harsher working conditions, mental health crises and a climate catastrophe, why does neoliberalism continue unabated today, and why is the Left continuing to take a beating? To put it in the crudest of terms, why are we turkeys continuing to vote for Christmas?

ii. Why Lacano-Marxism?

The ravages of neoliberalism are very much apparent. The question then begs, why continue to study it with a new theoretical perspective? What does a Lacanian-inflected critical study

of capitalism have to offer us? What fresh insights can be gleaned? It is in the pursuit of an answer to these questions that Lacano-Marxist studies of capitalism are more necessary than ever. This is because the overriding strength of utilising Lacanian psychoanalysis in anti-capitalist critique is the ability such a perspective possesses to explain the enduring nature of capitalism, even in post-crisis scenarios, by focussing the attention on the affective dimensions of contemporary social relations and structures. A Lacanian perspective opens up the possibility of understanding capitalism's continual pervasiveness as being rooted in the subconscious, rather than conscious. In other words, this approach helps us to understand why capitalism remains *despite* its effects rather than *because of* its effects.

Lacanian theory has become increasingly popular in the social sciences and the humanities, and while undoubtedly the most famous theoretician associated with this trend is Slavoj Žižek, it would be unrepresentative of the emerging field to focus squarely on him. Žižek's work, and in particular his own brand of ideology critique, are of central importance to this thesis, and as such is explored in depth in chapter one. At this juncture it is important, however, to explore the field outside of Žižek, in order to ascertain the contributions and novel insights Lacanian theory can give to studies of political economy, society and culture more generally. This allows for a better representation of the burgeoning field of Lacanian critique, but also allows a more accurate representation of this thesis as being located in a highly heterogenous and inter-disciplinary academic field rather than as one that is purely the product of the work of one person (Žižek himself). The subsequent paragraphs summarise some of the key theorists and writers working within this field and highlight their insights, underscoring why a Lacanian approach to studying contemporary capitalism is useful.

iii. The pervasiveness of capitalism

One of the most revered writers in this area is the late Mark Fisher who, under his online pseudonym k-punk, brought a blend of aesthetics, politics and psychoanalysis to a small but dedicated group of followers (Reynolds 18th January 2017). His landmark book *Capitalist Realism* (2009) explores how varied processes and cultural phenomena, from employment relations and practices to contemporary cinema, create the impression that there is no alternative to contemporary capitalism. He describes the title of his book as follows:

> 'It is easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism. That slogan captures precisely what I mean by "capitalist realism": the widespread sense that not only is capitalism the only viable political and economic system, but also that it is now impossible even to *imagine* a coherent alterative to it' (2009: 2. Author's own italics)

Fisher explores how contemporary capitalism is not defined nor is contingent upon policy, rather it maintains its dominance through a peculiar, yet nonetheless effective, manipulation of the subject, whereby each individual feels despondent, isolated and ultimately helpless. Reflecting upon managerial practices in post-industrial societies, Fisher remarks,

> '"Creativity" and "self-expression" have become intrinsic to labour in Control societies…which now makes affective, as well as productive demands on workers…Enough is no longer enough. This syndrome will be familiar to many workers

> who may find that "satisfactory" grading in a performance evaluation is no longer satisfactory" (*ibid.*: 39-40)

A new paradigm of control has emerged in which features and functions innate to the individual, such as the desire to express oneself through creativity, or the desire to improve and perform well, are now distorted and manipulated by the productive forces to ensnare the individual. This has, of course, serious effects on physical and mental health, and numerous studies have shown an increasing trend in workplace absences on health grounds, and even suicides, that is related to changing managerial and employment practices in line with the phenomena described by Fisher (see Teghtsoonian 2008; Roizen and Roach 2010; Brown and Baker 2013; Kyaw-Myint and Strazdins 2015; Harris December 2016). Indeed, it is rather poignant that Fisher himself succumbed to his own mental health struggles in 2017. Fisher's contribution to studies of contemporary capitalism is that today's capitalist societies do not simply wield a material demand upon the subject ("work harder", "produce more"), they also exert a subliminal pressure whereby even one's personal outlets of self-expression are utilised to further dominate and subdue. Fisher's tragic death is a reminder that this existence has harrowing consequences.

iv. The perverse role of enjoyment

That contemporary capitalism involves a stratification of power is not a new revelation. What the psychoanalytic critique of capitalism offers, however, is the root of this power. Another key cultural theorist that utilises Lacanian theory is Todd McGowan, who explores the concept of enjoyment as the source of capitalist domination and subjugation. In *The End of Dissatisfaction?* McGowan notes that the imperative to enjoy is now the foundation of contemporary capitalism:

> 'Capitalism, in its latest manifestation, has played a crucial role in working to de-emphasize prohibition or Law in the social order. The "commodification of everyday life" – the *sine qua non* of late capitalism – has the effect of, at once, undermining figures of authority and stressing the importance of enjoying oneself' (2004: 30)

The notion that the subject enjoys oneself has become the duty of each subject today. McGowan notes that capitalism has evolved to a stage whereby "enjoyment" becomes a command: 'In the epoch of global capitalism (and especially since 1989, with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the last major barrier to the flow of capital), duty is transformed into a duty to enjoy' (*ibid.*: 34). Of course, the individualistic, quasi-nihilistic character of capitalist consumption being the foundation of Global North societies is not new in critiques of capitalism. What is novel about McGowan's work, however, (and thus what is novel about the Lacanian critique of capitalism) is that the author uncovers how this enjoyment qua paradigm of control is in fact sustained and fortified by the enduring *dissatisfaction* of the subject.

In Lacanian theory, there is the concept of *l'objet petit a*, or, the object cause of desire. If the subject desires something, say a new smartphone, that object is the object of desire. What is crucial to that desire, however, is the barrier to the object. In the example of the phone, the barrier is the box. Once the barrier has been transcended (i.e. once the box has been opened),

the object of desire (the phone) quickly loses its appeal and becomes another banal and functional entity. The subject's desire of the object is sustained by the barrier – *l'objet petit a* (Kirshner 2005). McGowan notes that it is the barrier to consumption – the lack of money – that creates capitalist desire and thus fuels consumption and accumulation. In *Capitalism and Desire*, McGowan writes that, 'Capitalism's adherence to the fantasy of success at the expense of the necessity of failure is essential to its functioning' (2016: 105-106). In other words, the ideas of sacrifice, of striving and of failing are what sustain capitalism. Oddly, therefore, according to McGowan, it is eternal dissatisfaction that makes capitalist enjoyment possible. This enjoyment through dissatisfaction has the effect of further constraining individuals. In capitalist consumption, subjects readily move from object of desire to object of desire, constantly flipping from one thing to the next and postponing the confrontation with the lack of satisfaction in the object:

> 'Satisfaction exists in the obstacle that the object erects in the face of the subject's efforts to obtain it rather than in the eradication of all obstacles. But this is what the capitalist imperative to accumulate enables us to avoid confronting' (*ibid.*: 83)

We have thus created what McGowan calls a 'society of enjoyment', the effect of which is 'to convince subjects that they exist outside this society, in independent isolation. It thus becomes increasingly difficult to grasp oneself within the universal' (2004: 193). As subjects concern themselves only with the acquisition of the next object of desire, they fail to make the connection between their own subjectivity and the wider matrix of power relations within which their subjectivity is cast. Subjects experience their own sacrifices in the name of capital – a dying planet, longer working hours, poverty, physical and mental health issues, debt etc. – as positive and necessary steps in the pursuit of enjoyment. Issues of politics, economics, social justice, climate change and so on do not concern the subject for the subject is only concerned with continuing to make the sacrifice (enact the dissatisfaction) in order to achieve the promise of enjoyment encapsulated within the capitalist commodity-form.

v. The importance of fantasy

As McGowan intimates, there is a fantasy at play within the subject's subconscious. This is the heart of the Lacanian insight into capitalism: the subject's involuntary attachment to and investment in the prevailing socio-economic system. There is thus an element of fantasy that lies at the heart of capitalism. Jodi Dean's *Democracy and Other Neoliberal Fantasies* (2009) is particularly instructive on this and makes the connection between the desire of the subject and the appeal and success of political projects. Dean states that fantasies account 'for societies' failures, ruptures, and inconsistencies in ways that promise to produce enjoyment' (2009: 50). The egregious excesses of capitalism – poverty, climate catastrophe, inequality and so on – are "covered up" by the fantasies of the subject, often at the expense of a subaltern group or groups:

> 'One of the ways fantasy keeps our desire intact as desire is by telling us we haven't fulfilled it. It accounts for our failures to enjoy. We haven't fulfilled it, we haven't gotten it, we haven't *really* enjoyed because someone *stole* the enjoyment from us' (*ibid.*: 58)

The sacrifices made by the subject – the acts of dissatisfaction – which do not lead to permanent enjoyment (which is the promise of capitalism) are translocated onto a scapegoat. In Nazi Germany, that scapegoat was the Jew. In contemporary far-right movements, that scapegoat is the Muslim. For the right-wing governments in the West today (be they Trump's White House, or Johnson's 10 Downing Street), the scapegoat increasingly appears to be left-liberal "snowflakes" who are supposedly forcing a domineering agenda of political correctness upon an apolitical populace. For the Leave voters in the UK's 2016 EU membership referendum, the barrier to enjoyment was perfectly articulated as the European Union. Dean makes the connection between McGowan's analysis of consumption practices (elucidated above) and socio-political constellations and projects. While the barrier to the subject's personal enjoyment may be the cardboard box in which the smartphone is enclosed, the barrier to the subject's political enjoyment is whichever Other the state has designated. Dean's contribution here is the demonstration that both barriers originate from the same point: the subject's fantasy that defers confrontation with its own inner lack of completeness and therefore enjoyment.

The other contribution of Dean is her identification that what underpins the Othering process in liberal-capitalist politics (the translocation of *a* onto an empirical object-body) is the concept of politics itself. She notes that the individualism of the liberal-capitalist form is the true fantasy at play:

> 'The individual is itself an imaginary figure, as we learn from Lacan. Bourgeois ideology treats conditions that are collective and social – embedded in histories of violence and systems of exploitation – as if they were relationships specific to an individual, as if states arose through individual consent, as if politics were a matter of individual choice, and as if desires and capacities, affects and will originate from and reside in an individual form' (2016: 81)

The individual is disconnected from communal bonds, from connections with others. The idea of inter-subject connectivity is cast as alien, as political and therefore as an aberration. The subject is articulated within liberal capitalism as an agent of free will, an executor of choice. Politics is anything that attempts to deviate or distort that articulation and must be rejected. This is perfectly observable in western societies today. A lot of the narratives deployed by the Leave campaign in the 2016 EU membership referendum in the UK involved the idea that the EU was a group of troublesome politicians meddling in people's everyday lives. The same narrative is evident on the Right when issues of social justice are raised – "snowflakes" are over-politicising people's daily lives in the name of political correctness. The *objet petit a* is thus always articulated as devious, meddling and, above all, political. Politics itself is the barrier to enjoyment in neoliberal capitalism.

vi. Linking Lacan and Marx: the necessity of a Lacanian anti-capitalism

As a result, the pervasiveness of capitalism today can be explained by notions central to capitalism – free markets, capital accumulation, poverty, inequality, climate catastrophe etc. – being "explained away" not (just) by those in power, but by the fantasies deployed by the subject itself. Capitalism and all its egregiousness are elevated beyond politics, beyond critique and beyond reproach. Stavrakakis makes the case that it is this exact insight that

makes studying capitalism through the prism of Lacanian theory an absolute. The desire to remove the concept of 'the political' from the social terrain is symptomatic of the liberal-capitalist drive for total hegemonic domination. The notion of the political, of an antagonistic confrontation between subjective perspectives, is, for Stavrakakis, the evidence needed that our social reality is underpinned by a lack, and that it is incomplete. For this reason, Lacanian theory is fundamental:

> 'Underlying Lacan's importance for political theory and political analysis is his insistence on the split, lacking nature of the symbolic of the socio-political world *per se*. Our societies are never harmonious ensembles. This is only the fantasy through which they attempt to constitute and reconstitute themselves' (1999: 74)

Our social world (the Symbolic, in Lacanian language) is incomplete, and, as Stavrakakis says, it 'depends on fantasy in order to constitute itself' (*ibid.*: 78). The fantasy is that the incompleteness we sense is being caused by an Other which itself is intensely political. This is from where the positivism of contemporary capitalism stems. It is noted in multiple critical appraisals of capitalism that central to the neoliberal project is a positivisation of market economics – an articulation of capitalism as "the only way" (many of these studies are discussed in depth in chapter one). It is through Lacanian theory that the functioning of this positivism lies not (just) in the discourses of those in favour of the neoliberal project (the economists, captains of industry and politicians), rather it lies in the subject's subconscious, and is actualised in fantasies that help rationalise and foreclose the social reality the subject experiences.

This, therefore, is the utility in using Lacan to study capitalism: the uncovering of the importance of subconscious fantasy to our conscious, lived experiences; fantasy's direct relation with materiality. This is why the use of Lacan in combination with Marx is becoming ever more popular, the case for which is well-developed in Tomšič's *The Capitalist Unconscious* (2015). Tomšič demonstrates that the works of Freud, Lacan and Marx cannot just be read alongside one another, or played off one another, rather they must be read (and thus used) *in synthesis* with one another. Tomšič makes the case that the utility of an anti-capitalist psychoanalytic critique resides in the shared negative ontology of Marx, Freud and Lacan. That the subject is underpinned by a radical negativity, a void, allows for a reinvigoration for capitalist critique. If the subject is grounded in nothing, the subject must mobilise quickly to make sense of its surroundings – its social reality – in order to find its place. This mobilisation stems from the subconscious, meaning the pervasiveness and perseverance of capitalism can only be fully grasped and integrated into critique through a framework that accounts for and in fact privileges the deep-seated fantasies of the subject itself. It is not enough, therefore, when seeking to critique capitalism to only emphasise the domineering role of the bourgeoisie, as a rudimentary structuralist-Marxist position maintains, or to emphasise the near-monopolisation of narrative or discourse by those who rule as the varied postmodernist discursive positions would have us believe. In order to fully grasp capitalism's totality, we must seek a position that transcends consciousness. As Tomšič writes, 'capitalism stretches its consequences in the unconscious, but this does not imply that capitalism *is* the unconscious' (2015: 313).

vii. Enter Žižek

Thus, the importance of a Lacanian-inflected critique of neoliberal capitalism is elucidated. Specifically, this thesis grounds itself in the works of Slavoj Žižek, perhaps the most famous of the 'Lacanian Left', to borrow Stavrakakis' term. Žižek has been at the forefront of popularising Lacanian anti-capitalist critique. In fact, in reviewing Tomšič's book, he exclaims 'to be a Marxist today, one *has* to go through Lacan.' His particular contribution to the field is in the realm of ideology critique, breathing new life into a polemic that had been discarded by those on the Right as well as the Left. Žižek has "joined the dots" of (aspects of) Lacanian theory – such as the notions of enjoyment, fantasy and illusory reality – with the political economy critique of capitalism. In the words of Özselçuk and Madra,

> 'through encircling the "subjective logic" of enjoyment that supports the "structural logic" of the circuit of capital, [Žižek] has exposed while avoiding the liberal humanist ideology of individual choice and responsibility, ways in which the subject is ethically implicated in the reproduction of capitalist relations' (2007: 78)

Žižek's own reworking of both Marxian political economy and Lacanian psychoanalysis thus allows for a critical (re)imagining of neoliberal capitalism as an ideological structure that has a cyclical relationship between subject and object, and between dominated and dominator. The subject's subconscious complicity in the perpetuation of the capitalist mode of production transcends the rudimentary Marxist-structuralist view that capitalism continues to exist thanks to overt bourgeois oppression and enforcement, while simultaneously going beyond the discursive approach which broadly entails the view that capitalism is one of many politico-discursive projects that is merely better at articulating and hegemonizing itself (Feldner and Vighi 2007). A detailed engagement with Žižek's work is undertaken in chapter one, as is an exploration of the current status of capitalist critique as being split across two camps: Marxian political economy versus (predominantly Foucauldian) discourse analysis.
Žižek therefore opens up new spaces for critiquing the seemingly unshakeable permanence of capitalism, even in times of crisis. To return to the top of the section, it is his work, in conjunction with others, that helps us to understand why capitalism remains *despite* its effects rather than *because of* its effects.

Žižek's work, however, does have weaknesses (and these are weaknesses shared with the broader Lacano-Marxist literature) and they serve as the starting point for this research. These shortcomings are also explored in depth in chapter one, however they can be broadly summarised as follows: there is a weakness in Žižek's application, and a weakness in Žižek's own politics. On the former, Žižek has routinely failed to operationalise and deploy his theories in works of concrete political study (Gilbert 2007). As is common amongst political philosophers, it is seemingly up to those who engage with Žižek's work to test its validity rather than Žižek himself, though in the broader Lacano-Marxist literature this is also lacking. This, therefore, is one issue to be addressed by this thesis. On the second issue – of Žižek's own politics – it has been noted (Sharpe 2005; Johnston 2007; Özselçuk and Madra 2007) that Žižek has frequently focussed his critical lens on different sections of the Left (predominantly the Left in academia), both past and present. This has two consequences: the first is Žižek fails to concretely identify what contemporary capitalist (aka neoliberal) ideology actually looks like. He describes symptoms of it, rather than identifying it concretely (unsurprising when

much of his attention is directed away from capitalism itself and towards elements of the academic Left operating within it). Žižek's failure in this regard is addressed as a priority in this thesis. Secondly, Žižek fails to offer his own robust, well-rounded theory of how to articulate, organise and ultimately achieve a successful politics of emancipation. While that is not the focus of this study, some ruminations are offered up on this subject in the conclusion.

viii. Thesis synopsis

Having established the need to (continue to) critically explore and evaluate neoliberal capitalism, and the need to do so from a Lacano-Marxist perspective, it is now necessary to set out exactly what this thesis aims to achieve. This thesis' *raison d'être* is to contribute towards understanding why (neoliberal) capitalism continues to be the all-encompassing, all-determining feature of our existence. Building off the deficiencies in Žižek's work (and, as a corollary, the work of the broader Lacano-Marxist field), the first question posed by this research is, 'How does neoliberal ideology function?'. In order to address the methodological deficit in the Žižekian and wider Lacano-Marxist tradition, this thesis uses a form of discourse analysis to locate the logic of fantasy that sustains neoliberalism. This methodology is set out concretely in chapter two of this thesis. The objects of study articles published in political newspapers and theoretical journals associated with British left-wing anti-capitalist groups. By focusing on the Left it is possible to ascertain to what extent neoliberalism is an 'all-encompassing' ideology, insofar as such an analysis allows for any changes in Left discourse and narratives to be evaluated from the standpoint of to what extent does neoliberal ideology inform or otherwise affect critique and dissent? What is found in the analysis is that neoliberal ideology functions through by mobilising fantasies that depoliticise all facets of the social sphere and concurrently individualise the subject. This is achieved through a manipulation of discourse, whereby entities such as the state, its institutions and its actors are stripped of their political capacity and viewed instead as apolitical quantities. Using Lacanian language, the social sphere is stripped of the discourse of the Master (the discourse of power and capacity) and is replaced by the discourse of the University (the discourse of science, rationality and objectivity). The Master is not evaporated, however, and is instead relocated onto the subject itself. The individual is interpellated by governing institutions as an all-powerful entity that exercises its autonomous mastery through consumer choice, even at the ballot box. Ultimately, it is found that neoliberal ideology functions by nullifying anti-capitalist critique which is achieved by a complete reformulation of understandings of social relations.

The second question posed by this research is, 'How does this ideology-function of neoliberalism differ to that form of capitalism which preceded it?' In order to answer this, the decision was taken to look at articles in left-wing anti-capitalist newspapers and journals that covered, dealt with and analysed the Chilean neoliberal experience ('el Milagro de Chile'). As this period in Chile's history is taken by this thesis to be the first time that neoliberalism was firmly imprinted in a country, by looking at Left reactions to and analyses of this period allows for a tracking of discursive changes. As these discursive changes are taken as being representative of changes in the logics and forms of fantasies, it is therefore possible to witness when neoliberal ideology began to take hold on the Left. This analysis is counter-posed with a test-case from the right-wing pro-capitalist British media, in the guise of *The Economist*, so that a comparison can be made between discursive shifts on the Right and Left. What is found is that while the British Right embarks upon the ideological trope of

depoliticisation and individualisation, immediately after the coup of September 11th 1973, the British Left remains somewhat resilient to said changes until the late 1970s and early 1980s, whereby thereafter the same linguistic memes are found in both the left and right-wing press. It is concluded that this occurs because the neoliberal transformation of the United Kingdom does not get underway until 1979, with the election of Margaret Thatcher. What is seen thereafter is a process by which neoliberal ideology renders well-established Marxist critique of capitalism, espoused by the groups under analysis in this thesis, redundant, as the entire terms of reference are changed. In other words, as the state, its agents and its institutions are no longer viewed as political constructs, and as political subjects are no longer viewed as entangled in a matrix of capitalist exploitation (and are rather seen as supreme executors of choice and freedom), robust critique of capitalism is rendered insufficient. The answer to the second research question is simply that neoliberal ideology makes meaningful critique that much more difficult, in comparison to the previous iteration of capitalism that allowed said forms of critique permissible and meaningful (seen in the analysis of the material drawn from the 1970s).

The final research question posed by this thesis is, 'To what extent, if any, did oppositional voices submit to neoliberal ideology?' The intimation above is that left-wing anti-capitalist voices *did* submit to neoliberal ideological tropes. However, what is thrown up by this thesis is a slightly more complex picture, as in some cases in certain publications a form of withstanding to some of these tropes is found in the analysis. What's particularly interesting about those groups and publications that exhibit such a withstanding is that they are extant, having outlived a multitude of their left-wing peers, most of whom ceased operating around the end of the Cold War. This thesis does not take this fact to be merely coincidental, and instead opens up the possibility for future research of the British anti-capitalist Left to consider those groups that continue to exist to only be able to do so as they have, partially at least, withstood neoliberal ideology. A caveat is offered, however: given the small number of articles available for analysis post-1990 (only two of the groups under analysis in this project survive the end of the Cold War), the conclusion that their existence can be explained as a successful holding off of neoliberal ideology necessitates further study.

ix. Thesis structure

This thesis is comprised of eight chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of the theoretical foundations and rationale to this project while simultaneously teasing out the three research questions with which this project is concerned. The work of Slavoj Žižek is explored in depth, shortcomings in his work are identified, and his critique is mediated through different critical approaches that are already well-established in the social sciences in the study of neoliberalism. This chapter establishes not only the utility in using Žižek's ideology critique in political science, but also identifies ways in which weaknesses in his work can be addressed to make its use in political study more effective.

The second chapter constructs the case studies under analysis in this research, while at the same time justifying why it is right to revisit neoliberalism through a historical, transnational and anti-capitalist lens. The primary source material used in this project is newspaper and journal articles that covered Chilean politics which were published in various left-wing anti-capitalist British newspapers and journals. The period from which these articles are drawn is

1970 to 1999. These are contrasted with a test case from the capitalist 'Right' – the news magazine *The Economist* – whose articles are drawn from the same time period. In this chapter, the decision to revisit and expand upon 'el Milagro de Chile' is explained, as is the selection of the aforementioned source material.

The third chapter concerns the methodology and the research design. Žižek's ideology critique is revisited, and its Lacanian underpinnings are explored in further detail. This Lacanian focus is used to construct a methodology for utilising Žižek's ideology critique in political analysis. This is one of the contributions to the literature made by this thesis. No concrete attempt has yet been made to apply Žižek's ideology critique to specific case studies in an attempt to (re)interpret neoliberalism. As such, there is a profound methodological deficit. This is addressed in the third chapter by elucidating ways in which Žižekian ideology critique can be used in conjunction with discourse analysis

Chapters four to seven are the analysis chapters. Chapter four concerns the test case, *The Economist.* This chapter establishes the ideological tropes and mechanisms of neoliberalism as deployed by an influential sympathetic voice to the neoliberal project. Chapters five to seven concern the source material drawn from British left-wing publications, exploring the similarities and differences between Leftist reactions to 'el Milagro de Chile' with those published in *The Economist*. These chapters serve to establish the neoliberal ideology function within oppositional voices. The thesis concludes with chapter eight, in which summaries of the thesis' findings are provided and drawn together to answer the research questions articulated in chapter one. This concluding chapter also suggests avenues for further research that are opened up by this thesis.

1. Theoretical perspectives and foundations – establishing the research questions

i. Introduction

This chapter establishes the theoretical rationale that underpins this thesis. Through engaging with Žižek's Lacanian-founded critique of ideology, the research questions with which this thesis concerns itself are teased out and formulated. In section ii a brief history and summation of critical approaches to the concept of ideology is given. This allows for a tracking through history the common concept that is shared by different political philosophers over time, namely "false consciousness". Section iii then stands Žižek markedly in opposition to this "false consciousness'" tradition. This summary establishes why exploring ideology through his lens offers up new ways of understanding the issue. A more in-depth outline of the Lacanian basis to Žižek's ideology critique is provided in section iv. Section v follows in which multiple gaps in Žižek's work are highlighted when attempting to export his critique to political study and analysis. This provides the basis from which this research's rationale is derived while allowing the formulation of two of the three research questions at the heart of this thesis.

Having established the rationale for basing this research on Žižek's ideology critique (and orienting this research around said critique's gaps), sections vi to viii explore contemporary critical approaches to and understandings of neoliberalism. This literature review divides the existing work into three distinct approaches: neoliberalism as an economic project (section vi), neoliberalism as a modality of governance (section vii) and neoliberalism as a distinct and new form of the administration of law (section viii). The purpose of this literature review is four-fold. Firstly, it establishes the propriety for treating neoliberalism as a distinct phase in the history of capitalism, different to other iterations that came before it. Secondly, it identifies the complex nature of understanding the topic, as complementarities and stark differences between each approach are uncovered, justifying the desire of this thesis to provide a more unifying critical conceptualisation of neoliberalism. Thirdly, in exposing this need to "unify" the literature, a space is opened up into which a Žižekian-inspired conceptualisation of neoliberalism as ideology is justified. Finally, through exposing the weaknesses in the literature, a third and final research question is articulated. These determinations are laid out in section ix. The chapter concludes with some summary remarks in section x.

ii. False consciousness as the traditional unifying critique of ideology

The term ideology was coined by French enlightenment philosopher Antoine Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836). As Vincent notes, de Tracy used the term fleetingly, assigning many definitions to it, but the one definition that rose above the rest in de Tracy's usage was ideology as a "science of ideas" (Vincent 2010). From this definition arose the understanding of ideology as a term that denotes a political doctrine, and it is because of this phraseology that in common parlance today we conceive of the policy programmes of differing political parties and movements as belonging to or denoting differing political ideologies. Vincent explores how ideology took on a different notion, as denoting "false consciousness", with the works of Marx. Marx's critique of ideology as "false consciousness" shall be discussed momentarily however it is first important to make a clarification. Vincent implies that this notion of "false

consciousness" originated with Marx (*ibid.*), however this is incorrect. The concept of "false consciousness" stretches back to ancient Greek philosophy and is explored in depth by Plato in particular. Famous for *Republic,* among other works, Plato constructed the binary of "doxa" and "episteme". "Doxa" is the common-held view of the masses. It is an erroneous view imposed from above by the ruling elite to misdirect their true reality. "Episteme" is truth - or, reality. This is set out in *Gorgias* and is further developed in *Republic* (Richards 1966; Stauffer 2006).

This Platonist understanding of ideology ("doxa" in Platonist terms) has permeated Western philosophy and is a core issue in the works of Marx. The phrase 'we are not aware of this, nevertheless we do it' (Marx 2012: 72), and the prominence of the themes and issues related to it, attests to the centrality of ideology to Marx's thesis. This citation is taken from the first chapter of *Capital* in which Marx discusses commodity fetishism. The point Marx is making in relation to this quotation is that when we, subjects, attach a certain value to the products of our labour by relating them to the products of others' labour (this pair of shoes is worth *x* because their pair of shoes, which are of poorer quality than mine, are worth *y*), we are using products as substitutes for ourselves in social relations. In other words, we are exporting ourselves to the products we produce. For Marx, this is the ideology that underlies commodity fetishism and thus capitalism (Harvey 2010). As capitalism is the construct of the bourgeoisie, the ideology of commodity fetishism also follows as a construct. Thus, the Platonist idea of "doxa" - of an erroneous view of the masses - is evident in Marx.

Marx himself was greatly influenced by Georg Hegel; in whose own writings the impression of Plato is also felt. In his earliest works Hegel focused on how the Christian religion, and particularly the Protestant variation, individuated subjects in the Holy Roman Empire (or what was left of it at the time of writing) and served to enforce the dominance of elites in society. This was contrasted with the ancient Greek city-states - which Hegel idealized in his early writings - which were much more communal (Hegel called this 'totality' (Cullen 1979: 51)). Hegel put this down to the Greeks' reversion to folk religion (i.e. pre-Christian religion, or paganism). Rejecting the idea that Christianity replaced paganism through 'the sheer weight of evidence that showed…folk religions to be intellectually untenable' (*ibid.*: 79), Hegel concludes that Christianity is the tool of elites to dominate and that this domination stems from Christianity's ability to promote self-interest. As Hegel wrote, 'our religion wishes to train people to be citizens of heaven with their gaze ever fixed on high' (*ibid.*: 6). This has meant that societies comprised of individuated subjects are politically unfree 'when the purpose of life is whittled down to gaining one's daily bread plus a greater or lesser degree of comfort and luxury, and when interest in the state becomes a wholly self-seeking one' (*ibid.:* 17). The traces of Plato are again noticeable in Hegel. Putting aside his early admiration for ancient Greek societies, we see again the idea that the common-held view (the "doxa") of subjects in Hegel's world is erroneous, is constructed by elites (in this case through the guise of Christianity) and only serves to reinforce their dominance.

Lenin added an extra dimension to the Marxist critique of ideology. Whilst not removing the "doxa/episteme" division evidenced in Marx's theory, Lenin views (revolutionary) socialism as an ideology itself, an ideological weapon that is necessary to combat bourgeois ideology (Vincent 2010: 6). In *What is to be Done?* - originally published in 1902 - Lenin attacks social democracy as formulated by German politician and political theorist Eduard Bernstein. Lenin

opines 'since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the workers in the process of their movement *the only choice is:* either bourgeois or socialist ideology' (Lenin 1987: 188. Author's own italics). Despite conceiving of the class struggle as a battle between ideologies, Lenin's position still maintains elements of the "doxa/episteme" division. As Lenin writes, 'modern socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge' (*ibid.*: 187). Thus, there is still this sense that Marxist theory is still "correct" or "true", despite the acknowledgement of it being an ideology.

Antonio Gramsci, the Italian Marxist and co-founder of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), reformulated ideology and gave it a new moniker - hegemony. For Gramsci, hegemony (read ideology) is the manipulation of a nation's (or society's) traditions, myths and histories by the ruling elite which gains the elite consent from those over whom they rule, for their rule (Pozzolini 1970; Femia 1981; Hoare & Sperber 2015). The relationship between this elite and wider society 'is, in varying degrees, "mediated" by the whole fabric of society and by the complex of superstructure' (Gramsci 1992: 12). The structures of civil society mediate the role of the elite, diffusing their bourgeois ideology throughout society, ensuring their dominance. Gramsci's conceptualisation of the notion of hegemony moves the critique of ideology on further, building in this idea that the ideology-function is imposed through a complex process of cultural containment and domination, rather than simple explicit imposition. Again, however, the Platonist "doxa" is noticeable in Gramsci. Despite Gramsci viewing ideology as more than just a construct (it is also a manipulation), he nonetheless continues in the Platonist, Hegelian and Marxist tradition, viewing ideology as a false view imposed from above.

Louis Althusser is another important figure worth considering in the debates on ideology. Althusserian ideology is profoundly influenced by Gramsci and in 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', Althusser analyses the constructs in society that allow for the diffusion of Gramscian hegemony. Althusser identifies the 'State Apparatuses' that defuse this ideology and he divides them into the 'Repressive State Apparatus' (RSA) and the 'Ideological State Apparatuses' (ISAs - note how the RSA is singular and the ISAs are plural). The RSA is the repressive arm of the state, namely the police and armed forces, which keeps subjects in line and quells any dissent through repression and violence. The ISAs are multiple and promote ideology not through violence but through instruction. As Althusser writes, 'the Repressive State Apparatus functions "by violence", whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses *function by "ideology"'* (Althusser 1971: 138. Author's own italics). Althusser lists the ISAs as 'the religious, the educational, the family, the political, the trade-union, the communications and the cultural' (*ibid.*: 136-7). ISAs are crucial for Althusser, writing *'how is the reproduction of the relations of production secured?*…It is secured by the exercise of State power in the State Apparatuses, on the one hand the (Repressive) State apparatus, on the other the Ideological State Apparatuses' (*ibid.*: 141; Author's own italics). Furthermore, *'no class can hold State power over a long period without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in the Ideological State Apparatuses'* (*ibid.*: 139. Author's own italics).

The final theorist of ideology to consider is Ernesto Laclau, co-founder (along with Chantal Mouffe) of the Essex School of Discourse Analysis. The Laclauian critique of ideology is grounded firmly in discourse theory. Laclau breaks somewhat from the other theorists discussed up to this point insofar as he sees no distinction between ideology and truth ("doxa"

and “episteme”). Instead, Laclau conceives of all social structures as being linguistically-constituted - formed by language (Laclau 2006a). What this means is that there is no true/false dichotomy, only different discursive constructions. It is apparent from this point that there is a clear difference between the Laclauian critique and all the other aforementioned critiques. However, in an article published in the journal *MLN*, in which Laclau directly addresses and contests Žižek’s ideology theory, Laclau quickly points out that his critique does not do away with the notion of false consciousness entirely (something which Žižek’s does quite readily). Laclau writes: ‘Are we supposed to put aside entirely notions such as ‘distortion,’ ‘false consciousness,’ etc.? The difficulty is that if we simply do so, we enter into a vicious circle whereby the conclusions of our analysis negate its premises’ (Laclau 1997). To Laclau, the notion of “false consciousness” lies within ‘the very notion of an extra-discursive viewpoint’ (*ibid.*: 299). In other words, the ideological illusion is the notion that an objective truth or reality lies somewhere “out there” in an observable reality that exists outside of all discursive structures. Laclau’s critique certainly breaks from the truth/illusion dichotomy in many respects, however he stills holds on to this notion of false consciousness, albeit reformulating the concept and somewhat turning it on its head.

What is demonstrated by the relatively in-depth discussions above is that, despite the fact that some theorists appear to hold contradictory positions on “ideology”, the common thread that runs through their work is the notion of “false consciousness” as a blinding or veiling construct that obscures a certain “truth”. While the Platonist “doxa” may be vastly different to Lenin’s understanding of bourgeois ideology qua capitalism, or while Gramsci’s hegemony may be turned on its head by Laclau’s assertion that there is no such thing as objective truth, what unifies them all is the idea that some form of blurring or veiling process occurs in social relations. As was pointed out at the top of this section in reference to Vincent (2010), it is not uncommon to assume that “false consciousness” as the critical interjection in ideology originated with Marx. However, a further digging into key ideology critiques shows this to be incorrect. What this also helps establish is just how much of a break from “tradition” Žižek offers with his own ideology critique. Žižek does not just break with Marx, rather he breaks with a concept whose history is rooted in Ancient Greek philosophy, and this is explored in the following section. This therefore opens up space for further study in the ideology field in light of this new critical evaluation.

iii. Žižek: standing in opposition to tradition

One of Žižek’s earliest books, and one of his most comprehensive critiques of ideology, is *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (1989). From the outset, Žižek engages with the traditional viewpoint of ideology as a construction from above and sets out his task as critiquing ideology in the postmodern world:

> ‘The classic concept of ideology [is] as “false consciousness”, misrecognition of the social reality which is part of this reality itself. Our question is: Does this concept of ideology as a naïve consciousness still apply to today’s world? Is it still operating?’ (1989: 29).

Žižek’s critique of ideology begins with a critique of Sloterdijk, and thus it is important to first understand Sloterdijk before understanding Žižek. Peter Sloterdijk sets out to critique

ideology in novel terms by problematising cynicism. In *The Critique of Cynical Reason* (2008)[1] the author notes how cynicism is rife amongst citizens of Western European nations. People are aware of falsehoods and biases underlying the narratives spun to them by the media, politicians, and other elite figures of bourgeois society. Nonetheless, people still appear to adhere to ideology despite being aware of it. Sloterdijk calls this 'enlightened false conscience' (2008: 5). It is important to note here that Sloterdijk, while claiming we live in post-ideological times (insofar as ideology is no longer the unseen illusion - it is seen), we have not removed ideology entirely, rather we have merely accepted its presence. Sloterdijk concludes, '[ideology today] banks on the fact that all those who have something to lose come to terms privately with their unhappy consciousness or cover it over with 'engagements"' (*ibid.*: 8). This is because people feel they need to at least put up with ideology in order to ensure their own survival: 'the question of "survival", of self-preservation and self-assertion, to which all cynicism provides answers…' (*ibid.*: 9). Sloterdijk's critique of Ideology is novel because he recognises, through his problematisation of cynicism, that the Ideology-function has changed. Whereas before - as seen in the writings of Plato, Hegel, Marx, Gramsci and Althusser - ideology appeared to function in a largely uniform manner throughout history, now, according to Sloterdijk, the ideology-function has changed. It is no longer an invisible illusion, it is an apparent one that manipulates individuals into obeying through fear. One thing to note here, before continuing: Sloterdijk, despite not being a Marxist, is continuing on from the list of theorists explored above, insofar as he also views ideology as a construct imposed from above. This is an important observation because, in beginning his critique of ideology with one of Sloterdijk, Žižek quickly establishes a new perspective that not only breaks from Sloterdijk but breaks with all those that came before him.

Žižek starts his reformulation of ideology with the above quote from Marx – 'we are not aware of this, nevertheless we do it' – and reformulates it given Sloterdijk's perspective: 'they know very well what they are doing, but still, they are doing it' (Žižek 1989: 29). However, Žižek quickly asserts that Sloterdijk's notion – that we are aware of the ideology-illusion yet nonetheless put up with it – is fundamentally wrong: 'Cynical reason, with all its ironic detachment, leaves untouched the fundamental level of ideological fantasy, the level on which ideology structures the social reality' (*ibid.*: 30). Building from this position, Žižek offers a new critique. He poses the question with regards to the above Marxist formulation: 'Where is the place of ideological illusion, in the *"knowing"* or in the *"doing"* in the reality itself?" (*ibid.*: 30. Author's own italics). In other words, does the ideological illusion lie in whether we do or do not *know* of it, or does it in fact lie in our actions? Žižek's conclusion is the latter (Žižek 1989). As he states in his film *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology*, 'We think that ideology is something blurring, confusing our straight view… This is precisely the ultimate illusion. Ideology is not simply imposed on ourselves. Ideology is our spontaneous relationship to our social world' (Fiennes 2012).

Firstly, there is a clear similarity between Sloterdijk and Žižek insofar as both appear to distance themselves from the more 'traditional' critique of ideology as false consciousness. However, there is a nuanced distance. For Sloterdijk, ideology is still a form of consciousness that is imposed from above, however subjects are aware of this, evidenced through cynicism. For Žižek, however, the ideology-function is still illusory and still structures our social world

[1] Originally Published in German in 1983

without subjects knowing of it. Žižek develops this perspective through his own reading of Hegel and making a subsequent connection between Hegel and Lacanian psychoanalysis. In *The Ticklish Subject* (2008a) Žižek develops his thinking, and draws out a concept that underpins his ideology critique: the negative subject, or, the subject grounded in nothing. Starting with the Hegelian 'negation of negation' (*ibid.*: 85), Žižek posits that the subject is constituted in the Other, such that when the subject conceives of a world without the Other – for example, black and minority ethnic people imagining a world free of white supremacy – the subject's problem is that it fails to recognise the extent to which the subject is mediated by the Other and therefore the Other is never truly sublated. Therefore, in a world truly without white supremacy, the subject (ethnic minorities) ceases to exist also in that constellation of subjectivity: there is no minority without the oppressive white majority. Regarding capitalism, there is no worker without the bourgeoisie. In order for subjects to overcome their oppressive Other, they must first overcome the Other (the first negation, in Hegelian terms) and, crucially, must then overcome their own subjectivity (the second negation) – hence, 'negation of negation'. Through this Žižek arrives at the conclusion that Hegel's 'negation of negation' uncovers the radical negativity of the subject:

> 'Hegel's achievement was thus *to combine*, in an unprecedented way, *the ontologically constitutive character of the subject's activity with the subject's irreducible pathological bias.*' (*ibid.*: 87. Author's own italics).

This breaks with Kant's transcendental idealism, which sees reality as not existing prior to the 'positing activity of the subject' (*ibid.*: 87), but also sees the subject as a neutral-universal agent that directly constitutes reality. In essence, there is a much more complex, multi-directional relationship at play. Here, a link is established between Hegel and Lacanian psychoanalysis. The bias of the subject that constitutes 'reality' (or, rather the subject's perception of it) is understood, by Lacan, as the unconscious fantasy structuring the Symbolic. In order for the subject to maintain the Symbolic, aka big Other, unconscious fantasies must be deployed in order to conceal this 'reality's' radical contingency.

iv. Žižek, Lacan and the ideological fantasy

The notion of fantasy is fundamental to Žižek's ideology critique and it merits further investigation in order to first understand Žižek's proposition and secondly to tease out weaknesses in it. Žižek is profoundly influenced by the psychoanalytic theories of Jacques Lacan and it is from Lacan that he takes his understanding of fantasy. As he states in *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology*:

> 'Fantasies are the central stuff our ideologies are made of. Fantasy is, in psychoanalytic terms, a lie. Not a lie in the sense that it is just a fantasy and not a reality, but a lie in the sense that fantasy covers up a gap in consistency. When things are blurred, when we cannot really get to know things, fantasy provides an easy answer' (*ibid.*)

The key point Žižek is making here, and thus what distinguishes him from the litany of critical theorists that came before him, is that ideology is not merely a construct imposed from above, rather it is a spontaneous reaction of individuals to their social world. It is an

immediate attempt by the subject to make sense of their social reality. It is innate to the subject.

Exploring further the Lacanian basis to Žižek's understanding of fantasy it is possible to understand how he reaches his ideology critique. Žižek takes understanding of social reality from Lacan's triptych of the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real. The Imaginary is the narcissistic part of the subconscious that exerts demands upon the subject, creating fantastical images of both the subject and the subject's desires (Lewis 2008). The Symbolic, also referred to as 'the Big Other' (Hill 1999: 373; Žižek 2006a: 9), is the social world, which is inherently structured by language and linguistically-constituted rules and norms (Žižek 2006a), and it is the Symbolic that mediates the demands of the Imaginary, telling us what we can be and what is acceptable in the social world (Bruss 1981). The Real is that which permanently escapes signification in the Symbolic, that which cannot be symbolized (Fink 1997). The Real, in this sense, shares an affinity with Kant's "thing-in-itself" (*"das Ding an sich"*) (Critchley 1998)**.** Žižek's view of social reality, therefore, is firmly rooted in Lacan's conceptualization of the Symbolic order. Returning to the previously cited quote from *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology*, 'Ideology is our spontaneous relationship to our social world,' meaning that ideology is that fantasmatic element which sustains the Symbolic. It is not, as the thesis of "false consciousness" holds, that which blurs things as they really are, for things as they really are always escape signification. For Žižek, the ideological fantasy does not conceal reality, for reality as we know it is the ideological fantasy. Žižek's criticism of the "false consciousness" thesis is that nothing is being concealed by ideology, for nothing can be concealed. The "false consciousness" thesis therefore fundamentally misinterprets the concept of reality as being something which can be observed. It is an erroneous interpretation of reality being an observable Real, or in Kantian language, an observable *"Ding an sich."*

This is an important intervention by Žižek in the ideology debate for it opens up new avenues for understanding themes such as political identification, or in other words, why people believe the things they believe. By doing away with the notion of "false consciousness" – that notion that people believe what they believe because they are instructed to do so by elites – it is possible to readdress political identification. Žižek does this in his book *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (2002), in which he employs his Lacanian-inspired ideology critique in addressing popular reactions among the American public to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Žižek notes that, in the aftermath of 9/11, there was an immediate, spontaneous outpouring of "American pride" among US citizens: 'In the aftermath of September 11 the Americans *en masse* rediscovered their American pride, displaying flags and singing together in public' (Žižek 2002: 56). He continues,

> 'There is nothing 'innocent' about this rediscovery of American innocence, about getting rid of the sense of historical guilt or irony which prevented many Americans from fully assuming their national identity. What this gesture amounted to was 'objectively' assuming the burden of all that being 'American' stood for in the past - an exemplary case of ideological interpellation, which comes on the scene after the perplexity caused by some historical trauma. In the traumatic aftermath of September 11, when the old security seemed to be momentarily shattered, what could be more 'natural' than taking refuge in the innocence of a firm ideological identification?' (*ibid.*: 56-57)

Evident in this extract cited above is Žižek's notion of ideology being a 'spontaneous reaction'. Žižek goes on to explain that the 9/11 attacks are prime example of 'blowback' - an unintended consequence suffered by the aggressor following covert operations (though he does not use this term). This was an attack that citizens could not quickly place into context, considering they were largely unaware of US intervention in Afghanistan prior to the attack and the effects this intervention had on the formation of Al-Qaeda and other radical Islam terrorist groups in the region. Thus, this attack appeared to many as an attack on America as a concept and all that it supposedly stands for. It is here that the idea of ideology being the 'fantasy [that] covers up a gap in consistency' is strongly justified. Žižek conceptualises the 9/11 attacks as a disruption in the Symbolic, an intervention from the Real that creates a rupture in the Big Other. As this Real kernel escapes signification (as the Real will always be out of reach), ideological fantasies are deployed by subjects in order to make sense of what has happened. The fantasy in this case was that of American exceptionalism. America as the bastion of liberty, democracy and progress facing a totalitarian, anti-liberty threat. The novelty of this interpretation of the beginnings of the War on Terror lies in the fact that critical interpretations of the War on Terror regularly construe the Bush administration's foreign policy as being based on a manipulation of people's fears of further terrorist attacks (Collins & Glover 2002; Kellner 2003, 2006; Gershkoff and Kushner 2005; Esch 2010). While this prevailing narrative may have some merit, it fails to recognise that the overwhelming outburst of American exceptionalism and nationalistic pride from vast swathes of the American public actually preceded the creation and implementation of the so-called "Bush doctrine" (as evidenced by the public demonstrations to which Žižek refers in the passage cited above).

What Žižek's Lacanian ideology critique does is move the debate on ideology beyond postmodernist discourse approaches, such as that employed by Laclau. As seen in his interpretation of the 9/11 experience, Žižek maintains the idea of a universal truth. In Laclauian hegemony, however, there is not one truth but multiple subjective truths that compete for hegemonic status (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). Žižek, instead, upholds the view that there is, in Laclau's words, 'an extra-discursive viewpoint' (Laclau 2006a: 299). What distinguishes Žižek from the litany of ideology theorists that came before him (explored earlier) is that this extra-discursive viewpoint, this universal truth, is not something that can be uncovered and grasped by the subject. Rather, it forever escapes signification. This is, in psychoanalytic terms, the Real. The universal truth – this universality – is the fact that our subjective experiences of reality are nothing but our (failed) attempts to grasp the elusive Real.

Žižek explores this in *Tarrying with the Negative* (1993), in which he explains that this universality is revealed through contingency. In ideology, those who believe in it as a synoptic worldview are unaware of its inconsistency. Every ideology marginalises/excludes a group. Yet that marginalisation is always symptomatic of larger a problem which is concealed, exposing the contingency of the ideology. The universal truth of the social field (what is truly wrong) is thus only revealed at the margins, through the experiences of the abject group. For example, in anti-Semitism, Jewish people are articulated as an obscene surplus – the "Jew" – which is constructed out of 'a multitude of (imagined) features' (1993: 150). Anti-Semites thus express their anti-Semitism not just in terms of, "we hate Jews because they are greedy etc." but in terms of "we hate Jews because they are greedy etc. and they are that *because they*

are Jews". As Žižek states, anti-Semitism is rooted in the act of attempting to locate the kernel of the Real: '[this] is precisely that elusive X "which makes a Jew into a Jew" and for which we look in vain among his positive properties' (*ibid.*: 150). This universality, this "what is truly wrong", is not a correct worldview, as the traditional ideology critique – elucidated above – maintains. It is not the science of Marxism which removes the blurring view of bourgeois ideology. It is not the real state of things which is concealed to us by an all-knowing and benevolent philosopher king (à la Plato). Žižek's ideology critique does not return the questions of ideology, discourse, reality etc. to a more rudimentary structuralism. It transcends the binary of structuralist positivism ("this is right, and this is wrong") and postmodernist relativism ("it's all right and it's all wrong").

It is from this insight that this research takes its impetus to examine the ideological function of contemporary capitalism (hereby referred to in this thesis as 'neoliberalism'). This research therefore takes Žižek's ideology-critique as its foundation and seeks to uncover the 'bottom-up' fantasmatic elements that underpin neoliberalism as an ideology. This research goes back to the early 1970s and identifies the Pinochet-led junta in Chile (1973-1990) as the first state to implement neoliberalism as a coherent governmental, legal and economic project. The coup of 1973 which deposed the democratically-elected centre-left government led by Salvador Allende, in the same vein as Žižek's interpretation of 9/11 – as a moment in which a rupture in the Symbolic order was opened up and after which subjects scrambled to understand this moment of violence by deploying ideological fantasies. However, this thesis also understands the coup as an act that allowed for the transformation of capitalist ideology. Therefore, this thesis actually modifies somewhat Žižek's thesis. In order to explain this modification, the following section critically engages with Žižek's work and uncovers weaknesses in it, which also justify this research's necessity and validity.

v. Shortcomings in Žižek's thesis

The first principal issue with Žižek's work identified by this research is that much of it concerns the deconstruction and analysis of popular culture. What is most typical of some of Žižek's more widely known and influential works is that they use metaphors from global cinema (usually Hollywood cinema) to illustrate his ideas[2]. This feeds into the related issue that it is quite rare for Žižek to dedicate considerable time to deconstructing political process and events in his published material. Furthermore, in those instances in which he does relate his concepts and ideas to politics, those instances are mostly metaphorical and illustrative rather than analytical. This is particularly evident in *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (2002) and *The Parallax View* (2006b). This makes for a challenging weakness in his work for those concerned with political study, namely that he provides no comprehensive methodology for applying his Lacan-founded ideology critique to politics. This is therefore one such hole in the literature that shall be plugged by this research. In chapter 3, a detailed and lengthy discussion is had on the construction of a Lacan-inspired methodology which is appropriate for this study.

What also must be recognised, furthermore, is that in those cases in which Žižek does address political processes, there is no uniformity in his approach. By that what is meant is that Žižek

[2] Examples include *The Parallax View* (2006b), *The Plague of Fantasies* (2008b), *Event: A Philosophical Journey through a Concept* (2014)

regularly moves between discussing very different and temporally detached phenomena. A striking example of this is his book *In Defense of Lost Causes* (2008c), in which a variety of political processes, including the French Revolution, the Chinese Cultural Revolution, Stalinism and Nazi Germany all come under analysis. This means that Žižek has yet to dedicate any time to studying one particular case study. Not only does this add to the methodological deficit mentioned above, it also means that despite being a self-professed Marxist and despite being intellectually concerned with critiquing capitalism, a rigorous analysis of capitalist ideology and, more specifically, its current neoliberal "uniqueness", is conspicuous in its absence in Žižek's work to date. These are concerns highlighted by critical theorist Jeremy Gilbert, who accuses Žižek's work of thus lacking academic rigour (Gilbert 2007). Indeed, Gilbert attacks Žižek for spending too much time focussing his analyses on aspects of the academic Left, rather than the capitalist Right which he professes to oppose:

> 'Žižek's main objects of attack have been on the left. Specifically, a loosely connected set of political positions and intellectual tendencies largely associated with the legacy of the "New Lefts" has been the thing that Žižek has chosen to focus his critical attentions on. "Cultural studies," "political correctness," "feminists," "multiculturalism," postmodernists, post-colonial studies historicists and deconstructionists: despite his avowed anti-capitalism, it is not capitalism and its specificities but the same litany of hate-figures that populates the fevered imagination of the American Right for which Žižek has reserved most of his ill-informed ire' (*ibid.*: 62-63)

The sum of this, Gilbert contends, is a critique of capitalism that is poorly focussed and often poorly defined. Gilbert concedes that Žižek makes great contributions to the realms of cultural theory and political philosophy, but ultimately concludes that Žižek is asking 'all the right questions' but is giving 'all the wrong answers' (*ibid.*: 61). This is a position shared by Özselçuk and Madra, who believe that Žižek's critique of capitalism is only partially baked, as it provides a comprehensive and convincing account of the affective dimension of capitalist consumption, but not much else (2007).

This research addresses these issues head on by taking elements of Žižek's ideology critique and utilising them in a rigorous study of the ideological functioning of contemporary neoliberal capitalism. From these gaps identified in Žižek's work, this thesis crafts its main research question and a corollary secondary one: using Žižek's insight on the fantasmatic element of ideology, how does neoliberal ideology function? And, by extension, in what ways does this functioning differ to that form of capitalism that preceded it? These two questions are the first to be established in this research and shall serve as the research's focal points around which the analysis takes place. One particular gap in Žižek's work, which stems from the partiality of his critique of capitalism, is that Žižek has yet to cover the process of ideological change. In other words, Žižek's work focusses on ideology *in situ* and not the processes by which one ideology replaces another, or indeed how one ideological edifice undergoes variations and modifications in order to preserve its longevity. The broad concept of "change" is most resolutely addressed in Žižek's 2014 book *Event: A Philosophical Journey Through a Concept*. However, as is common with Žižek's work, this is a deeply philosophical piece which largely discusses the notion of the 'Event' in the abstract, often with references to the contemporary world (again, typically cinema) being used as metaphorical devices

rather than being subjected to rigorous analysis. In fact, the titular word of the book, 'Event', is a reference to the work of Žižek's close friend and frequent interlocutor Alain Badiou, setting the tone for a philosophical work rather than one of political study. Therefore, this research takes Žižek's Lacanian ideology critique "back in time" to analyse the processes which led to the construction and institution of the neoliberal ideological edifice. The historical location for this study revolves around the 1973 Chilean coup and the subsequent military junta. The justification for using this event as the focal point around which this research's case study is constructed is set out in chapter two and therefore further discussion of this is reserved for that chapter.

The failure to discuss change in any determined and methodical way leads to another frequent criticism levelled at Žižek by contemporaries: that Žižek's politics is, at best, ill-defined, and, at worst, non-existent. His failure to engage with the question of "what comes next?" means that he has failed to provide his roadmap for radical politics and emancipation. As Gilbert points out, Žižek has frequently called for the Left to re-embrace Leninism (Gilbert 2007; Žižek 2001; 2004; 2017). Yet, on occasion, Žižek has also advocated a passive aggressive retreat from political action so that the Left may re-think its entire theoretical basis, as has been highlighted by political theorist Matthew Sharpe (2005). While this thesis is not primarily concerned with constructing a new agenda or manifesto for future Leftist political praxis, some thoughts on this subject are offered at the end of the concluding chapter, reflecting on the work of other theorists who have attempted to incorporate a Žižekian-Lacanian perspective into the question of radical political activity, such as Jodi Dean (2012; 2016) and Saul Newman (2001).

In the following section, a broad review of the literature on neoliberal capitalism is undertaken in order to establish why it is not only necessary to study neoliberalism as a means of expanding upon Žižek's work, but also as a means of expanding upon existing scholarly work on neoliberal capitalism that has thus far approached the subject from varied ways that are distinctly different to the Žižekian one undertaken by this research. It is demonstrated in section vi that the shortcomings in Žižek's work and the gaps in existing literature on neoliberalism can be addressed simultaneously by studying neoliberalism from a Žižekian-inspired ideology critique. Before going on to undertake this review, however, it is important to first summarise the research questions that have been constructed in light of the shortcomings in Žižek's work that are highlighted here. It is also important to reaffirm the ways in which this study addresses these weaknesses. Firstly, it is noted that Žižek has yet to offer a robust analysis of contemporary capitalist ideology, or neoliberalism more specifically. This leads to this study's primary research question: how does neoliberal ideology function? The secondary question that follows on from this is, 'In what ways does this functioning differ to that form of capitalism which came before it?' It is right to acknowledge that, 'that form of capitalism which came before it,' has yet to be established in this thesis thus far. This is a deliberate omission as this is established in the following sections. What also emerges from this weakness (that Žižek is yet to concretely analyse capitalist ideology) is that there is also a methodological deficit, and thus one of the contributions this study makes to the literature is providing a methodological schema that is tailored to utilising Žižekian ideology critique in political study. Further to the lack of a study of contemporary capitalist ideology and the related methodological deficit, the final issue identified here is the fact that Žižek is yet to concretely analyse the processes of ideological change or modification. Thus, by analysing the

origins of neoliberal capitalism (located in the 1973 Chilean coup and the military junta that followed), this study also contributes to the literature in this regard. In the following section, a final research question and further contributions to academic literature are established through an extensive review of the existing historiography of neoliberal capitalism.

vi. Historiography of neoliberal capitalism: neoliberalism as economics

A common approach in existing literature is to understand neoliberalism as a broadly economic programme. This stems from the origins of the term itself, "neoliberalism", which was coined by German economist Alexander Rüstow. Rüstow, the originator of the term, defined it as a suite of economic policies premised around the primacy of the free market and the rollback of state intervention of the economy (Boas & Gans-Morse 2009). The theoreticians (such as Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek) and heads of state (such as Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and Augusto Pinochet) commonly associated with the neoliberal project all advocated such policies, and therefore there is a certain validity in approaching neoliberalism from an economic perspective. This understanding of neoliberalism is most commonly mobilised in comparative analyses that compare the neoliberal project with that variation of capitalism which came before it. A term that has been used to describe this pre-neoliberal era is 'postwar consensus' (Lowe 1990; Marsh et al. 1999; Hickson 2004), and it is the term to be used in this thesis. The consensus era of capitalism in the West is broadly accepted to have been characterised by broad agreement between three key stakeholders in the economy: the state, labour (represented by trade unions) and capital (represented by business federations), hence the term 'consensus' (Lowe 1990; Hickson 2004; Studlar 2007). The state placed key sectors of industry under its control and planned industrial strategy in concert with important private sector businesses and organised labour. Economic policy was broadly aligned with core tenets in Keynesian theory, such as counter-cyclical spending and long-term planning (Duménil & Lévy 2005; Palley 2005). Much of the postwar consensus literature focusses on the UK, where these characteristics were particularly evident (indeed much of the work cited thus far focusses on the UK), however, as Fourcade-Gourinchas and Babb (2002) discuss, these characteristics could be found in many other countries in the global north and global south. The concept of the postwar consensus is contested (see Marsh et al. (1999)), however the contrast between this period of capitalism and that which succeeded it (broadly understood as being from the mid-late 1970s onwards) is clear. The form of capitalism that replaced the consensus era is labelled by this thesis as neoliberalism. The fundamental tenets of this new form of capitalism are understood as being in line with Rüstow's definition: free markets, deregulation, privatisation, tight control of the money supply and stringent trade union controls (Duménil & Lévy 2005; Studlar 2007; Cerny 2008).

While the fundamental tenets of neoliberalism as an economic doctrine are broadly accepted by political economists and historians (as evidenced by those cited above), there are some authors who perceive further assumptions inherent to neoliberalism that transcend the policy paradigm. Higgs (2014) highlights the fundamental importance of conceptualising economics as a science to the neoliberal project:

> ‘Much of the mystification that has surrounded neoclassical economics [read, neoliberalism] is related to this quest for scientific status and the credibility it conferred - supposedly elevating economics above the other social sciences’ (*ibid.*: 82).

Elevating neoliberal economics to the status of an indisputable natural science was central to the thought of key neoliberal intellectuals. Friedman often talked of providing “treatments” to “cure” economies, deploying language akin to that of a medical practitioner (Klein 2007). Ludwig von Mises once remarked, ‘if history could prove and teach us anything, it would be that private ownership of the means of production is a necessary requisite of civilization and material well-being’ (von Mises 2009: 72). This quote belies von Mises’ belief that the trajectory of history, and of human development, follows the logic of trial and error, of experimentation. Hayek also shared an inherent epistemological positivism from which he derived his belief that the neoliberal economics of free markets and deregulation were the only way to guarantee economic progress and social justice (Madra & Adaman 2018).

A further assumption inherent to neoliberalism is the concept of agency. Looking at the role of women as conceptualised in neoliberal economic development frameworks, Wilson (2013) describes a specific understanding, and concomitant promotion, of agency within neoliberal approaches to economic development. The neoliberal understanding of agency revolves around the idea of displacing structural forces that craft inequalities such as poverty, racism and misogyny onto the notion of choice. The effect of this is to, ‘obscure or marginalise questions of subordination and exploitation,’ (*ibid.*: 86). All questions regarding racism, misogyny, poverty and all other forms of oppression are rendered impotent as oppression is insidiously reformulated as self-imposed through poor rational decision-making. Neoliberal approaches to development are thus centred around the market and broad notions of empowering individuals within market frameworks. This empowerment is supposedly born of knowledge, and thus the idea of being able to “help oneself” is conceived (*ibid.*). From this, a broader formulation of ‘the knowledge economy’ is born, an economy in which the subject is permitted the necessary tools (i.e. knowledge through education) with which they can make something from themselves in the economic order (Olssen & Peters 2007). Crucially, however, what education itself looks like, and what its function should be, is also reconceptualised through a neoliberal lens. Education institutions, particularly higher education institutions (universities), are encumbered with the same demand as private businesses - to exist in an economically proficient manner and to act as a business. Education itself is similarly re-organised, with entrepreneurial skillsets being at the core of education. The reason being, ‘In neoliberalism, the state seeks to create an individual that is an enterprising and competitive entrepreneur’ (*ibid.*: 315). Thus, a very narrow concept of agency lies at the heart of neoliberalism: agency is the notion that the subject is responsible for all structural constraints imbued upon them and is only permitted to overcome these obstacles through entrepreneurial behaviours acquired through a particular educational framework. This is a conclusion shared by Boltanski and Chiapello (2005) who find that employment practices in the private sector have radically changed under the neoliberal turn. Employees are now addressed and understood by their employers not as workers, but as careerists. The importance of this change in managerial discourse lies in the fact that high levels of unemployment and job insecurity, intrinsic features of contemporary capitalist economies, are countenanced by firms stressing supposed virtues such as “career mobility” and hiring wage-earners in the context of “projects” rather than having wage-earners

dedicate their lives to the business (*ibid.*). Again, this particular conceptualisation of agency shines through.

The final tenet of neoliberalism that is uncovered by aspects of relevant literature is that of discipline through economics. Di Muzio (2018) is particularly instructive on this. Di Muzio explores the disciplinary role debt, both public and private, plays in the neoliberal globalised economy, concluding that the proliferation of debt and leverage in national economies and private households serves the function of further entrenching inequalities. These are inequalities on the public level, whereby key centres of capitalism (such as the USA) are kept in their dominating role by, '[ensnaring] the developing world in perpetual debt service to Northern banks' (*ibid.*: 465). These inequalities also exist on a private level, whereby heavily indebted households are subjected to ever-deteriorating working conditions through the necessity of servicing their ever-ever-increasing private debt levels *(ibid.*). On the public level, this is a conclusion shared by Smith et al. (1994) whose work uncovers the vicious debt cycle that ensnared many Latin American economies following the debt crisis of the 1980s. On the private level, Barkan explores the disciplinary role played by corporations in maintaining 'practices of disciplining and governing populations and territories' (2018: 455).

Therefore, alongside the well-known policy prescriptions of free markets, privatisation and deregulation, neoliberalism can also be understood as an economic programme that promotes itself as scientific law, conceptualises the subject as having supreme agency and authority over itself, and as having a disciplinary role in maintaining economic inequalities and systems of oppression. What emerges from this section of the literature is that neoliberalism is still broadly understood as having a primarily economic agenda that promotes the rapid accumulation of wealth by a small section of the population. Without wishing to ascribe any labels to the above-mentioned authors, what this subsection of the literature characterises is what can be called a critical political economy (CPE) approach, very much in line with well-established Marxist interpretations of capitalism. The idea that neoliberalism is understood as a science, and the subject as a rational actor exercising agency within that scientific framework, has a likeness to Gramsci's hegemony thesis. Neoliberalism's positivism and promotion of rational choice and agency evokes an image of a type of capitalism that is germinating a new cultural hegemony, whereby a new culture of economic decision-making is permeated throughout the social body. The idea of neoliberalism having a disciplinary effect through the proliferation of debt and leverage chimes closely with classical Marxian understandings of capitalist economics whereby the workers are ensnared in a system that benefits only the profit-making class - the bourgeoisie.

The next section of the literature that is examined shifts away somewhat from this CPE-likened interpretation of neoliberalism and places a greater emphasis on public governance - the ways in which governments regulate and control citizens through neoliberal norms. Thus, there is a shift from locating neoliberalism in its economic function and instead to its non-economic, governmental operation.

vii. Historiography of neoliberalism: neoliberalism as governmentality

Much of the governance literature on neoliberalism applies Foucault's governmentality concept to the neoliberal project. Before discussing this literature, it is important to

summarise this concept. Developed in the latter stages of his life, Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality conceptualises the art of governance as a mechanism for shaping citizens in the image of the state. Foucault devised three forms of power: sovereign power (a form of power relations in which the subject has no choice but to abide by the power wielded by the state without question), disciplinary power (power held by institutions that disseminate knowledge, such as schools and prisons, which is used to discipline the subject), and governmentality. Governmentality is differentiated from sovereign and disciplinary power by the fact that it is a form of power relations in which the subject appears to wilfully participate in their subjugation. Governmentality is thus a form of power utilised by the state to control the subject through the subject controlling themselves (Dean 2009; Bevir 2011). The use of Foucault to analyse neoliberalism is unsurprising as his concept of governmentality was formulated in response to the newly unfolding neoliberal landscape towards the latter years of his life (Foucault died in 1984). Governmentality was conceptualised by Foucault as an attempt to understand the multifaceted aspects of power within this new paradigm, and much controversy surrounds Foucault's own relationship to the neoliberal project, as some authors have claimed that Foucault was in fact much more sympathetic to the project than was once thought (Dean 2018). Nevertheless, Foucault's work continues to be a major influence on those who study and critique neoliberalism.

At the heart of Foucault's theory of governmentality lies his conceptualisation of subjectivity and the process through which human beings become subjects. The subjectivisation process is intimately linked with knowledge, and the manner in which the self is objectified in the process of the pursuit of knowledge[3]. According to Foucault, in the process of seeking to understand a certain aspect or phenomenon of human existence, humans are objectified and categorised (Foucault 2017). Through this process, the individual is thus rendered a subject, and therefore must act according to the "best" or "ideal" category (Taylor 2009). For example, in order to understand how human learning and betterment functions, standardised testing is introduced into schooling. Students are then categorised into good or bad students, measured against the mean. Students are therefore rendered subjects and must then strive to act according to the mean, so as to not become a "bad student." This subjectivisation then has impacts on the future of the subject. The "bad student" has significantly fewer opportunities for a good a prosperous life, meaning the effects of subjectivisation do not take place solely in the immediacy, but there are long term impacts also (Graham and Neu 2004).

The above conceptualisation of subjectivity and the subjectivisation process leads to Foucault into the concept of biopower and, latterly, biopolitics. Foucault describes biopower as 'the set of mechanisms through which the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power' (Foucault 2007: 16). Foucault draws a distinction between juridical power – the power of a state or sovereign to implement a law and punish those who break it – and biopower, which he sees as a technology of power through which states or sovereigns can manage, regulate or otherwise control the physical and mental capacities of the subject (*ibid.*). Returning to the example of the student and the exam, the student is acutely aware of the power the teacher yields in their ability to mark the

[3] It is important to clarify that Foucault does not see knowledge, or truth, as objective and universal. As Lorenzini (2016: 66) accurately describes, 'truth is not inscribed in the heart of reality, as an essential and original attribute of it that we simply have to discover; instead, it is always *produced* in relation to a specific reality, and this production generates a series of *effects*'

student's work. The teacher's marks impact the student's degree classification, which is then used by employers to judge not only overall employability, but also things such as salary, benefits, responsibilities and career progression. Through their own awareness of this dynamic, the student then self-regulates their behaviour in the image of the teacher's ideal which is an extension of the state's ideal. Foucault maintains that biopower has a disciplining effect, as the subject is moulded in the image of the state. Failure to behave accordingly is met with punishment. If one fails to comply with the law, one is sent to prison. If one fails to submit to the state-instituted education process, one fails to get a decent job and is destined to a life of poverty (Clayton 2013). The disciplinary effect of biopower takes place, therefore, through the establishment of a "norm," against which the subject is judged (Foucault 2007).

The idea of the 'norm' leads Foucault to another realisation: that biopower's disciplinary effect is only possible through the medium of a group. In other words, the concept of the population becomes fundamental. Discipline as described above may be experienced by the individual subject, but it cannot be meted out individually. The population becomes of central importance to the state and its power for the population is the source of the state's wealth. It is the lifeblood and sustenance of the state. Therefore, biopower becomes particularly concerned with the question of the "good" or "optimal" or "right" population. The population is used to derive an average subject, against which the population at large is measured and around which it must coalesce (Foucault 2007).

The above components come together to create Foucault's governmentality thesis. Governmentality is the art of governance, through which the state governs by getting the subject to govern itself. The state derives from the population that exists within its territory a "norm" or "ideal" against which the subject is measured. The subject is either rewarded or punished depending on how they measure against this norm. The subject's behaviour is therefore constantly checked and moderated, not by an external authority, but by themselves. The 'ideal' populace is drawn from a particular form of knowledge. Not knowledge in the positivist-normative sense of an objective truth, but a specific knowledge that is both designed and uncovered by those in authority.

Mark Bevir is one such individual who invokes Foucault's governmentality thesis in his conceptualisations of neoliberalism. Bevir uses governmentality as a lens through which he interprets the economic policies associated with neoliberalism that are explored by the political economy school of literature discussed above (such as privatisation, deregulation and so on). He comes to the following conclusion:

> 'Neoliberalism constructs and enforces an individualisation of responsibility…Neoliberalism is thus a form of governmentality within which individuals discipline themselves to use their freedom to make responsible choices. Individuals are expected to examine and govern themselves so as to improve their lives in ways that benefit themselves, their community and the state' (Bevir 2011: 465-466)

Another who utilises Foucault in his study of neoliberalism is Jason Read, who applies governmentality to the concept of *homo-economicus,* or, the economic man. Read concludes that reformulating the subject as an actor that makes decisions on a cost-benefit analysis has the effect of constraining the subject, closing him/her off from communal bonds and ensuring

that no challenge can be made to the neoliberal hegemony. The effect of this isolation of the subject is to promote neoliberalism as the only way, for the subject's economic behaviour is articulated as supreme rationality:

> 'The ideal of the fundamentally self-interested individual curtails any collective transformation of the conditions of existence…It is perhaps no accident that one of the most famous political implementers of neoliberal reforms, Margaret Thatcher, used the slogan, "there is no alternative," legitimating neoliberalism based on the stark absence of possibilities' (Read 2009: 35)

Vander Schee reaches similar conclusions through a micro-level analysis. Her 2008 study of employee health programmes instituted by a school district in the US state of Nevada gives credence to the idea that neoliberalism is more than just accelerating profit making. Such programmes under Vander Schee's analysis included, 'opportunities for employees to participate in fitness, smoking cessation, and stress management regimes, as well as to partake in dietary and healthy lifestyle counselling' (2008: 855). Vander Schee concludes that,

> 'Health programs such as this represent a kind of neoliberal eugenics program wherein the healthy are praised, the sick are censured, and the school district alleviated from any fiscal responsibility…These programs can also operate as a powerful form of neoliberal governmentality bound up in economic rationalities and ideological constructions of the *ideal* self' (*ibid.*: 871. Author's own italics).

Themes of individualisation and personal responsibility are once again intimately bound up in processes of social control and subjugation. Moreover, these processes are actualised through the willing participation of the subject who sees their participation as a rational behaviour of self-improvement.

The three authors discussed here provide a snapshot into a different approach to understanding neoliberalism to that offered up by CPE. Understanding neoliberalism as a matrix of power relations between the state and the subject echoes the broader division between Marxist and Foulcauldian perspectives. This thesis draws together seemingly competing interpretations of neoliberalism through the lens of the Žižekian-Lacanian ideology critique, and as such the rift between Foucault and Marx is one such division harmonised in this thesis. Drawing together these two perspectives is nothing new. Jacques Bidet's 2016 book *Foucault with Marx* is one such concrete attempt at drawing complementarities between the two. Bob Jessop neatly summarises that, 'while Marx seeks to explain the *why* of capital accumulation and state power, Foucault's analyses of disciplinarily and governmentality try to explain the *how* of economic exploitation and political domination' (2007: 40). It is this small body of work that this thesis builds upon and adds to in its formulation of a more holistic theory of neoliberalism. The penultimate subsection of this literature review details the complementarities this thesis draws between the seemingly disparate areas of literature on neoliberalism that are summarised here, and so such a discussion is left to that subsection rather than undertaken here. The following subsection concerns the final area of the literature on neoliberalism - that which understands the neoliberal project as a legal one. As is uncovered, those taking such a perspective approach neoliberalism through a jurisprudential lens.

viii. Historiography of neoliberalism: neoliberalism as law

The final broad category of literature on neoliberalism focusses on the legal aspect to the project. As Aksikas and Johnson Andrews state, 'in the neoliberal conjuncture, the law has been assigned a peculiarly central place and given a special form of efficacy and potency' (Aksikas & Johnson Andrews 2014: 755). Juridical approaches to neoliberalism throw up a broad term to denote neoliberal legal frameworks: 'new constitutionalism'. This term, according to Gill, denotes an attempt, 'to allow dominant economic forces to be increasingly insulated from democratic rule and popular accountability' (Gill 1998: 23). The mechanism used to achieve this goal is constitutional law, which is utilised to embed a particular social order (neoliberalism) without recourse to contest or change this. Fundamental to this agenda is the promotion of and adherence to the concept of "the Rule of Law", a concept which elevates legal structures to a status of incontestability, akin to a natural law such as gravity. In establishing neoliberal norms such as individualism, deregulation and free markets as a set of "rules of the game", the fundamentals of neoliberalism become insulated from contestation (Gill 1998; Gill & Cutler 2014). These insights thus add another dimension to the literature on neoliberalism: that the neoliberal project fundamentally rests on legal frameworks and constitutional law rather than economic policies or modalities of governance (governmentality).

Multiple studies have been conducted which locate and analyse the fundamental importance of the rule of law to neoliberalism. Such studies are typically 'micro-level', analysing specific manifestations of legal frameworks and their mobilisations to maintain neoliberal order. One such example is the work of José Atiles-Osoria, who found that the criminalisation of protesters by the state during the student strikes at the University of Puerto Rico in 2010 and 2011 indicated a particular operation of law that nullified legitimate dissent to neoliberalism by articulating said dissent as operating outside legal parameters (Atiles-Osoria 2013). What this study shows is how neoliberal logic is deployed in legal frameworks in order to establish what is and is not permissible in the neoliberal order. In this case, contestation of neoliberal policies such as the marketisation of higher education was deemed criminal. Similar conclusions were reached by Mihic (2008) and Denbow (2017) in their analyses of civil liberties protections in the United States. Both found a neoliberal marketisation logic behind the operation of the rule of law, Mihic in her analysis of the US Supreme Court's support for terminally ill patients to refuse life-sustaining treatment[4], and Denbow in her analysis of the landmark *Hobby Lobby* Supreme Court case of 2014[5]. Thus, further evidence is provided in the argument that neoliberalism is a legal project that utilises law to determine what behaviour is and is not acceptable. Neoliberalism is thus enshrined in legal practices and is rooted in the elevation and establishment of the concept of the rule of law.

[4] Mihic stipulates that in recent years the Supreme Court has articulated its support to refuse treatment according to the logic that one's right to life follows the logic of the right to maximise utility of the self, insofar as the terminally ill patient has the right to die as efficiently as possible once their utility in life has come to an end.

[5] The *Hobby Lobby* case of 2014 established that privately-owned corporations had the right to refuse employees access to contraception in employee healthcare plans if such treatments contravene the employer's religious beliefs. What Denbow surmises is that by protecting *Hobby Lobby*'s right to religious freedom, the Court is individualising corporations according to a neoliberal logic. Furthermore, the Court's decision rests on the fact that evading the provision of contraception would incur legal penalties, including fines, meaning the logic of the market is introduced into the rationality of the Court's decision.

Particularly instructive on the relationship between neoliberalism and the rule of law as a concept is Christopher May. May locates neoliberalism's reliance on the rule of law in the work of jurist Hans Kelsen and his concept of *grundnorm*, or, 'basic norm' (May 2014). The *grundnorm* is the unspoken acceptance of the basis upon which a legal framework is established. It is the concept that renders the entire legal framework indisputable (Kelsen 2008). As May puts it, the *grundnorm,* 'is not produced as part of the establishment and reproduction of any specific legal system but rather predates it: *the initial social desire for the rule of law must precede its origin*' (May 2014: 64. Author's own italics). What is posited, therefore, is that the foundational element of neoliberalism lies not in economic policy nor in governmentality, but in an implicit acceptance within the social body that neoliberalism is fundamentally correct and desired, not just by state and corporate actors, but by the social body as a whole. May asserts that the *grundnorm* of neoliberalism conceals contestation as it elevates neoliberalism to an incontestable status. This lack of contestation therefore is not simply imposed from above but is also germinated from below. The *grundnorm* always follows, 'an initial (original) moment of force, or assertion of legitimate authority' (*ibid.*: 66), indicating that an interruption to the established state of things, as such, sparks a need or desire within the social body for a new calm and order to be established. This is an important point as it opens the possibility that neoliberalism's self-justification stems from a break or a rupture which compelled subjects to seek an ideological edifice that could close said rupture. This echoes Žižek's claim that ideological fantasy 'covers up a gap in consistency' (Fiennes 2012), as was discussed at length in section iv of this chapter. This apparent overlap between the jurisprudential literature on neoliberalism and Žižek's ideology critique is set out in the next section, which establishes the complementarities between the three strands of literature on neoliberalism reviewed here. In this section it is posited that Žižek's ideology critique can act as a unifying perspective that can suture CPE, governmentality and jurisprudential critiques of neoliberalism.

ix. Seeking complementarities in the literature through mediation of Žižek

The above literature review has established three distinct approaches in critical evaluations of neoliberalism. The first, labelled by this thesis as the "CPE approach", conceptualises neoliberalism as a predominantly economic project that seeks to intensify the capital accumulation and profit-making processes in capitalism by entrenching corporate power, disciplining workers through debt and leverage, and reconceptualising the subject as a fully autonomous agent that makes rational cost-benefit analyses in their decision-making. The second approach conceptualises neoliberalism as a modality of governance. Leaning heavily on Foucault's concept of governmentality, this approach sees neoliberalism as a new matrix of power in which the state maintains its control over the subject by articulating the subject as an individual and encumbering upon him/her an intense sense of personal responsibility and accountability, which serves to isolate the subject from establishing common bonds with others that may allow for contestation and dissent. The third approach is a juridical one, which asserts the idea that neoliberalism is broadly a legal project insofar as it protects itself from contestation by embedding neoliberal logic in legal frameworks and elevating said frameworks to a status akin to that of a natural law. These three approaches to neoliberalism can be neatly characterised as focussing on economics, statecraft and jurisprudence. To put it much more simply, neoliberalism can be understood through three different lenses:

neoliberalism as economy, neoliberalism as state, or neoliberalism as law. This research bridges the gaps between these three different conceptualisations and offers up a more holistic theory of neoliberalism: neoliberalism as ideology. This is done by using Žižek's ideology critique as a unifying theory that binds together these three disparate camps. In order to set this out it is important to highlight commonalities between these three distinct critical approaches and also the differences between them in order to open up a space into which Žižek's critique can enter.

Firstly, there are clear complementarities and clear differences between the CPE approach and the governmentality approach. The complementarities rest in the effects of individualisation on the subject. Both the governmentality literature and the CPE literature come to the broad agreement that individualisation, which sits at the heart of neoliberal economic policy, has the effect of subjugating the subject to a form of power dominion. The process of further ensnaring the subject within an asymmetrical power framework is articulated as a process of liberating the individual from the supposed ravages of state intervention in the economy, reconceptualising the subject as an actor of choice and personal responsibility. A further similarity resides in the directional travel of this asymmetrical power. Both sets of literature see power dominion as being top-down, implemented by the state for specific purposes. The differences lie in the fact that the governmentality literature conceptualises neoliberal economic policies not as a tool to simply entrench corporate power, facilitate the capital accumulation process and subjugate workers within the capitalist mode of production, but as a means of maintaining state power through the self-disciplinary role of governmentality procedures. Economics is thus a tool for state power, not for capital accumulation. The key difference therefore is that governmentality literature stresses the complicity of the subject in his/her domination, whereas CPE literature is much more structuralist in its perspective, stressing further the constraining and shaping role of key state and non-state actors. The juridical literature appears to share this perspective with the governmentality approach, insofar as the juridical literature recognises the complicity of all actors in elevating the concept of the rule of law to the status of something that must be uncritically accepted. This is uncovered through the application of Kelsen's *grundnorm* thesis to the concept of new constitutionalism, as is done by May (2014). However, there is also overlap between the juridical approach and the CPE approach insofar as both recognise the importance of marketisation to entrenching the capitalist mode of production (recognised by Mihic (2008), Denbow (2017) and Atiles-Osoria (2013)).

There is thus a need to make sense of these competing perspectives that both overlap and simultaneously stand in direct opposition to one another. One author that suggests a way forward in this is Simon Springer, who conceives neoliberalism not as economy, state or law, but as discourse (2012). Springer writes that neoliberalism, 'is a discourse that encompasses material forms in the state formation through policy and program, and via the subjectivation of individuals on the ground, even if this articulation still takes place through discursive performatives' (*ibid.*: 143). It is in this understanding of neoliberalism as discursive procedure that Žižek's understanding of ideology as fantasy is useful. It is established earlier in this chapter that Žižek's critique is built on a Lacanian understanding of language and structural linguistics (see section iv.). The fantasy operation played by ideology is born from the subject's inability to articulate the Real, and instead seeks to make sense of this gap by constituting the Symbolic through language. The fantasy of neoliberalism, as uncovered by CPE,

governmentality and juridical literatures, is the (re)articulation of the subject as the individual that possesses all authority and rationality and one that acts within a system that rewards cost-benefit analyses, marketisation of the self and whose norms and rules are ensconced in a conceptualisation of the rule of law as an immutable "rules of the game". Neoliberalism is thus an ideological fantasy that profoundly affects subjectivity through the complicit articulation of the subject as a market-oriented individual (governmentality approach), which is reflected in an economic programme that enhances the capital accumulation process (CPE approach) and that is rendered incontestable through a broadly accepted, pre-agreed *grundnorm* (juridical approach). Mediating Žižek's ideology critique through these three separate lenses makes possible a more holistic understanding of neoliberalism as a form of ideological fantasy born through discourse that has material effects (on economics and jurisprudence) and effects on subjectivity. This serves as this thesis' theoretical rationale and this is used to analyse the case studies in this research. The next two chapters set out the case studies selected for this research (chapter 2) and the research design and methodology (chapter 3), in order to explicate how this holistic theory of neoliberalism as a discursive ideological fantasy can be analysed.

Before concluding, it is important to reflect once more upon the directional travel of subjugation to neoliberalism. As stated above, the literature offers conflicting conclusions on this issue. Again, conceptualising neoliberalism as ideology can offer an insight here. The CPE approach is resolutely "top-down", seeing the process of neoliberal entrenchment as being instigated by economic elites, whereas the governmentality and juridical approaches perceive a more complex process of complicity on behalf of the subject. However, these two approaches still maintain a "top-down" perspective in their analyses. The authors mentioned above look specifically at the actions of the state (governmentality approach) and legal institutions and frameworks (juridical approach). There is as of yet no robust analysis from a "bottom-up" perspective. This is an important gap in the literature considering both of these perspectives stress the idea that neoliberalism's success, in part, lies in its ability to close off and deny contestation. Therefore, a third and final research question emerges: to what extent (if any) did oppositional voices submit to neoliberal ideology? Addressing such a question fills the gap in the literature identified, providing an understanding and analysis of neoliberalism from the "losers'" perspective (the "losers" being those who attempted to withstand neoliberalism's establishment and entrenchment in the project's formative years, yet failed to prevent it). Žižek's ideology critique is instructive and useful in addressing this question due to its emphasis on the role of fantasy. The literature discussed in this chapter predominantly focusses on the *actions* of institutions and their actors. In focussing on the the *reactions* of oppositional voices to these actions, the operation of fantasy in ideology can be uncovered. This thesis tracks the reactions of those opposing neoliberalism as they seek to make sense of a newly unfolding ideological landscape. This links back to Žižek's contention that ideology operates at the level where the subject seeks to make sense of the social world. Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis construct appropriate case studies (chapter 2) and a methodology (chapter 3) for testing this complex hypothesis.

x. Concluding remarks

This chapter establishes the theoretical rationale that underpins this thesis. This research project is concerned with the broad concept of "ideology". As such, the first section after the

introduction (section ii) provides a historical overview of the development of critical approaches to this concept, ascertaining a common theme that runs through the works of varied thinkers that have theorised on this topic. That theme is "false consciousness", whereby ideology is conceptualised as a false view of things imposed upon the masses by an elite group within society. This thesis takes its theoretical inspiration and impetus from the recent additions to the ideology debate made by Slavoj Žižek, and as such the third section of this chapter provides a summary of Žižek's ideology critique, elucidating a contrast between Žižek and the litany of theorists that came before him. Žižek's thesis is condensed into a summary that stipulates that his contribution to the debate does away with false consciousness altogether, positing instead that ideology is not a veil that blurs things as they really are, rather it *is* things as they really are, as that which we perceive to be reality *is* ideologically manifested and constructed. This novel approach to ideology critique is inspired by Žižek's understanding of Lacanian psychoanalysis and structural linguistics, which is briefly reviewed in section iv. Despite Žižek's undoubted influence on contemporary critical theory, this thesis identifies shortcomings in his work when seeking to apply his ideology critique to political analysis and study (section v). In identifying and exploring these shortcomings, the first two research questions to which this thesis is dedicated to resolving are formulated: 1) How does neoliberal ideology function?; 2) How does the ideology-function of neoliberalism differ to that form of capitalism which preceded it?. The first question is formulated in response to Žižek's lack of robust political analysis of the functioning of ideology in contemporary capitalism (identified by this thesis as neoliberalism). The second question arises as a corollary, affirming the need to ratify the idea that contemporary capitalism (neoliberalism) is a different iteration of capitalism to a previous form.

In order to fully satisfy the requirement that these questions need answering (and are therefore yet to be answered by existing literature), an exhaustive review of existing literature on neoliberalism is undertaken in sections vi to viii. This chapter splits the literature into three distinct camps: that which conceptualises neoliberalism as an economic project (section vi.), that which conceptualises it as a modality of governance and statecraft (section vii), and that which identifies it as a new approach to the administration of law (section viii). First and foremost, the literature review establishes neoliberalism as a new form of capitalism, broadly instigated in the mid to late-1970s, that advocates marketisation and a rollback of state intervention in the economy, thus differentiating itself from the form of capitalism prevalent in the west in the pre-1970s postwar period. This thesis uses the term "postwar consensus" as the descriptor for this pre-neoliberalism variation, term widely used (though not without controversy) in existing literature (see section vi). This literature review also uncovers complementarities and stark differences between each critical interpretation of neoliberalism (see section iv). The complementarities lie in each approach's understanding of neoliberalism as having a profound impact on subjectivity, whereby the subject is (re)articulated as a rational individual severed from common bonds and ties, ensnaring the subject in a form of power dominion which simultaneously closes off the possibility of contestation and dissent. One difference lies in the end result of the subjectivation. CPE (section vi) and juridical (section viii) approaches see the end result as being material - the further entrenchment of the capitalist mode of production, whereas the governmentality approach (section vii) interprets the end result as being a more abstract and blurred understanding of control and discipline of subjectivity. This is one space that is opened up into which the Žižekian ideology critique can enter, insofar as it allows for a more holistic

understanding of neoliberalism as having effects on both materiality and subjectivity. Thus, this research provides a more holistic understanding of neoliberalism that unifies the three existing disparate critical interpretation: neoliberalism not as economy, state or law, but as ideology. Another difference lies in the directional travel of subjectivation. The CPE approach is the most structuralist of the three which sees the process as very "top-down", whereas the other two are more nuanced, seeing the process as involving a degree of complicity on behalf of the subject. All three, however, are "top-down" in their analysis, approaching neoliberalism from a perspective of the actions of institutions and their actors. This thesis thus offers up a third research question which addresses this imbalance in the literature: to what extent (if any) did oppositional voices submit to neoliberal ideology? Addressing this question provides a new element to the existing literature on neoliberalism: a "bottom-up" analysis. Having established both the theoretical rationale of this thesis and the questions to which this research is dedicated, the next chapter (2) constructs, explores and justifies the case studies which are analysed to resolve these questions.

2. Establishing the case studies: constructing a study of neoliberalism as an ideology

i. Introduction

This chapter establishes the case studies that are analysed in this thesis in order to answer this thesis' research questions (set out in the previous chapter). There are multiple components to the case studies in this research. The complexity of the cases reflects the complexity of the overarching thesis and its theoretical rationale. In the first instance, this thesis is concerned with analysing the broad concept of neoliberalism as an ideology. The decision was taken to explore this topic by returning to the originating moment of neoliberalism as a project, which this thesis identifies as being the Pinochet-led military dictatorship in Chile, 1973-1990. As this thesis is also concerned with the process of ideological change, the scope of this research extends back before the beginning of the regime in 1973, to the beginning of the previous government in 1970, that being the *Unidad Popular* (UP) government of 1970-1973. This allows for an examination of the processes involved when one iteration of capitalism (identified in the previous chapter as 'post-war consensus' capitalism), is replaced by another (neoliberalism). This period of change in Chile, from Allende to Pinochet, also reflects a broader change in capitalism globally. In the early 1970s, the global economy, and particularly the economy of the West, was rocked by the "Nixon Shock" and subsequent oil crises, which provided the context in which the neoliberal turn gained political traction in key centres of capitalism (most notably, the UK and the United States) (Stedman Jones 2012). Sections ii and iii of this chapter provide an extensive summary and review of the existing historiographies of Allende's government (section ii) and the coup that deposed and replaced him with General Pinochet (section iii). Furthermore, as set out in the previous chapter, this thesis understands neoliberalism as an ongoing iteration of capitalism that continues to exist. As such, the end date for analysis in this research is not 1990 (when Pinochet left office and Chile transitioned to democracy), but 1999. The justification for using this date as the endpoint for analysis is included in section iv, in which a historical overview of Pinochet's rule and legacy in Chile is given.

This thesis is also 'transnational' in its approach, insofar as the sources selected for study in this thesis are newspaper and journal articles from left-wing anti-capitalist publications from the UK, in which goings-on in Chilean politics are covered. This is done for two reasons. Firstly, the existing historiographies on neoliberalism downplay the importance the Pinochet regime had in establishing neoliberalism as a valid project (this is uncovered in section iii of this chapter). As such, by focussing on Global North reactions to goings-on in the Global South, this thesis challenges this narrative of neoliberalism being a predominantly Anglo-Saxon venture. Secondly, as was discussed at length in the previous chapter, the existing literature on neoliberalism tells the story from the "victors'" perspective. That is to say, the existing literature focusses on the actions of institutions and their actors, and the success they had in implementing the neoliberal project. What is missing, therefore, is a story of neoliberalism that analyses the Left's *failure to successfully contest* neoliberalism. The decision to select the UK as the country from which the principal source material is drawn was based on the remarkable similarities between the UK's and Chile's political and economic trajectories throughout the years under analysis. A summary of the UK's political and economic history between 1970 and 1999 is provided in section v. The source material analysed is drawn from specific date ranges between the broader range of 1970-1999. This decision was made to

make the analysis more manageable. However, the dates selected are not random, rather they have specific significance in both the histories of Chile and the UK, and as such it makes sense to structure the analysis around these dates. The dates themselves and why they were selected are also detailed in sections iv and v, following which a review of the groups (and their publications) under analysis is provided in section vi, setting out which groups and publications are chosen for study and why. Finally, this research uses a test case from the Right against which the coverage of the Left is compared. The British newsmagazine *The Economist,* has been selected to act as this test case. A brief review of *The Economist* is provided in section vii, justifying the publication's selection in this research. This chapter concludes with section viii, in which all elements of this case study are drawn together.

ii. Allende's Chile

The election of Salvador Allende to the Chilean presidency in 1970 was not just a momentous occasion in Chile but was a historic one for liberal democratic politics worldwide. Allende has been described as the first Marxist to be freely elected as head of state in a liberal democracy in the world (Faúndez 1988). Allende had been a leading figure in the Chilean Socialist Party (*Partido Socialista* – PS) since the 1930s. He served as Health Minister under Pedro Aguirre Cerda's Popular Front government in the late 1930s and was leader of the PS since the 1950s, contesting four Presidential elections (1952, 1958, 1964 and finally 1970, in which he was successful) (Muir & Angell 2005). The ideological makeup of the PS, and indeed the ideological composition of the broader Chilean Left, is a somewhat confusing picture, and therefore merits discussion. Despite being a self-confessed Marxist, Salvador Allende had 'an impeccable Parliamentary record' (Collier & Sater 2004: 328). At no point in his leadership of the PS, and certainly at no point during his three-year Presidency, did Allende ever call for the revolutionary overthrow of the Chilean state. Allende's strict adherence to Parliamentary democracy and Chile's constitution often stood him in opposition to much of his party. The party itself even voted to adopt popular revolution as official party policy in 1967 (Furci 1984). Despite this, Allende's leadership maintained the party's longstanding history of directly engaging with Chile's democratic institutions and traditions. Allende's election in 1970 was keenly observed by the anti-capitalist Left in the region and throughout the world, as is exemplified in chapters five to eight of this thesis (in which the left-wing source material is analysed). His presidency provided a test case for the well-established debate over socialist strategy: can socialism be achieved through parliamentary means or must the state be overthrown? The PS was (and still is) one of the two main parties of Chile's Left, the other being the Communist Party of Chile (*Partido Comunista de Chile* – PCCh). Up until the suspension of democracy in 1973, the PS was considered by historians to be further to the left than the PCCh, which itself was much more of a democratic socialist organisation than a communist one (Corkill 1976; Furci 1984; Llanos Reyes 2011a). As such, Allende drew much support from the leadership of the PCCh, which was instrumental in holding together the often fractious and internecine UP governing coalition of 1970-73 (Amorós 2008). Both parties drew the bulk of their support from the Chilean trade union movement, and the Central Union of Workers (*Central Única de Trabajadores* – CUT) – Chile's largest trade union confederation at the time – had direct links to both the PS and the PCCh (Drake 2003).

Despite being the leader of a relatively radical left-wing party, Allende's own belief in gradualist political strategy and the support he drew from the democratic socialist PCCh was

reflected in the policies enacted by the UP government. One of the most well-known policies, and most well-covered by academic research, is his land reform programme. The process of land reform was initiated by Allende's Presidential predecessor, the Christian Democrat (*Partido Demócrata Cristiana* – PDC) Eduardo Frei Montalva, who was President between 1964 and 1970. Chile's economy in the first half of the 20th century was dominated by an antiquated land system whereby much of the land was owned by a small number of wealthy families. This system was a hangover from the colonial era. To address this, the PDC government of 1964-1970 embarked upon a programme of reform whereby land was gradually redistributed from these landowning families to landless agrarian workers (Kennedy & Murray 2012). The measures were broadly supported by the Chilean capitalist class and the US, who saw the measures as necessary to prevent the further spread of communism in the region in the wake of the Cuban revolution (Bellisario 2007). Allende's successful election campaign was in part based on the promise to further land reform, which many poorer voters perceived as happening at too slow a pace. For the large part, Allende made good on his promise and land expropriations accelerated after his inauguration (Thomas 2011). Crucially, however, Allende did not introduce further legislation to this end, and instead continued to implement existing legislation introduced by his PDC predecessor (Crow 2007). This is one example of Allende's reformism and adherence to parliamentary norms. Despite growing support among landless agrarian workers for more radical measures (such as land seizures without compensation to owners), Allende withstood this pressure and stuck to his parliamentary principles, recognising that such proposals would fail to pass through the Chilean legislature (the UP was, after all, a minority government) (Steenland 1974).

Further evidence of a moderate approach to policy is found in Allende's nationalisations of key industries. Allende's electoral platform was built around modernising the Chilean economy through government intervention (land reform being one of such policies). Another key component of that platform was bringing under public control Chile's natural resources, including copper, coal, salt, steel and iron (Vidal Molina 2014). As with agrarian reform, Allende accelerated the nationalisation process that was initiated under Frei Montalva. Nationalisation of copper had support across the political spectrum, including the right-wing National Party (*Partido Nacional* – PN), however Allende pushed further, bringing other mining sectors as well as large parts of the banking and financial sector under state management. Again, these measures were achieved through strict adherence to legislative process (indeed, the PDC attacked Allende's nationalisation programme on the basis that the President was allegedly 'abusing legislative loopholes,' rather than acting illegally or unconstitutionally (Medina 2006: 580)). Attacks from the Left were not uncommon, and members of Allende's own party, the PS, frequently criticised the government for not acting quickly enough on nationalisation and for compensating business owners (Reyes 2011b). Similar to what happened with agrarian reform, extra-judicial seizures of factories and plants by workers were a relatively common occurrence during the UP years, and Allende refused to endorse them (Collier & Sater 2004).

Allende often appeared to be fighting a battle on two fronts: fighting the Right over accusations of being too radical, and the Left over not being radical enough. This often saw the President come into conflict with his party's own supporter base – the trade unions. Industrial unrest was a common characteristic of Allende's presidency, and while some strikes and disputes were orchestrated by Allende's right-wing opponents for political reasons (such

as the 1972 truckers' strike, which was funded by the CIA to destabilise the Chilean economy (Aguilera & Fredes 2006)), some were genuine attempts to secure better pay and conditions for unionised workers. In such instances, Allende rarely gave in to the unions' demands, and sought to either negotiate an end to disputes or simply refused to engage (Reyes 2011b). Despite drawing much of his electoral support from organised labour, Allende's government was in many ways not a reflection of the trade union movement's politics or policies. What emerges, therefore, from the historiography of Allende's presidency is an image of a government that may well have been Marxist in rhetoric but was not in praxis. The UP government therefore reflects a wider trend of capitalist economic management in the mid-20th century West. A government that was committed to long-term economic planning and industrial strategy (evident in the nationalisation and agrarian restructuring programmes), but one that was not willing to acquiesce to any and all demands of organised labour, and one that was not willing to countenance strategies and policies that contravened existing legislative frameworks. Allende's Chile, thus, shared many of the characteristics of 'post-war consensus' capitalism, whereby the state based its economic policymaking on elements akin to Keynesian economic theory and acted as a mediator between the competing demands of capital and labour. This form of capitalist economic management is a similarity held with the United Kingdom during the same time period. This is explored in further depth in section v of this chapter, where a history of UK politics and economics is given and further similarities between the trajectories of the two countries are drawn out. Before that, however, it is important first to explore the coup that deposed Allende (section iii) and the dictatorship that replaced him (section iv).

iii. The coup

The 1973 coup is an event in Chilean political history that has received extensive analysis from academics and this broad body of research can be split into two camps. There is the literature that stresses the role of the US government and its intelligence agency, the CIA, in the destabilising and ultimate removal of the Allende government; and then there is the literature that views the coup as a Chilean process – a coup that was instigated, supported and carried out by Chileans. In this second grouping, the US is seen more as a secondary character that provided the means for the coup, rather than the leading antagonist. Thus, there is a binary within the existing literature: those that view the coup as an international process, and those that view the coup as a Chilean process.

Much of the first group of literature approaches the coup from a US perspective. The more authoritative works from this perspective approach the coup from a history of the CIA or US foreign policy more generally during the Cold War years. These works were typically published post-2000, as much of the CIA intelligence documents pertaining to the 1973 coup were declassified by the Clinton administration. Such works highlight the importance of Latin America as a region to Nixon's foreign policy (Kornbluh 2003; Weiner 2007) and the role US corporations played in agitating for a coup to remove Allende from office (Qureshi 2009). Some authors within this grouping place the coup within the wider lens of the history of US-Latin America relations. Calvert (1994) sees the coup and the subsequent Pinochet regime as part of a regional tendency of 'military developmentalism – the doctrine that the military should stay in power for long enough to create a strong army in a strong country with a strong economy' (*ibid.*: 43), while also implying that Pinochet's installation was the result of US

distrust of non-aligned states with regards to the Cold War (*ibid.*: 213-214). Menjívar and Rodríguez (2005) take a similar approach to Calvert with a specific focus on state terrorism and political violence, grouping the episode in Chilean politics together with other military regimes in the region and paints them as an extension of US anti-communist strategy.

While the literature mentioned is important for understanding the coup, taking a purely US-focus of the coup leads to an unfortunate downplaying of the "Chilean-ness" of it. The coup is portrayed as a political process intimately tied up with the Cold War and US expansionism in Latin America. What is ignored is the Chilean dynamic. This is an issue confronted by the second broad group of academics: those who read the coup as a principally Chilean rather than a US or international political process. This body of literature is somewhat broader and more diverse, with many different perspectives taken by different authors. Some focus on the role of Chilean business and the Chilean elite in the coup (Sigmund 1977; Power 2002); other authors focus on the UP government itself and how it undermined its own political credibility through internal schisms and alienating its supporter base (Silva Solar 2008; Reyes 2011b; Negri 2012; Fermandois 2013). Some have highlighted the emergence of a small yet influential neo-fascist movement in Chile that helped to spread anti-communist rhetoric in the run up to the coup (Grugel 1985; Griffin 1993; McGee Deutsch 2009; Bertonha 2015). Similar to this line of inquiry, other authors have focussed on the destabilising effects of the radical left group, the Revolutionary Left Movement (*Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria* – MIR), which further decreased support for the UP by spreading the idea that the government was a capitalist stooge (Whitehead 1974; Colectivo Diatriba 2011; Goicovic Donoso 2015). There has also been some output from academics who have focussed on the role the centrist Christian Democrats played in destabilising the Allende regime (Huneeus 2003; Luna et al 2013; Fleet 2014). The aforementioned works approach the "Chilean-ness" of the coup by looking at the social and political forces involved in the coup itself. There is, however, another body of work that approaches the coup from a *longue-durée* perspective, placing the coup within a broader historical and geographical context. Koonings & Krujit (2002) examine the links between militaries, state violence and nation building in Latin America. In this piece, the coup is seen as the pinnacle of the politicisation of the Chilean military. Esparza et al (2010) adopt a similar approach, interpreting the coup and resulting political violence under the junta as a Chilean process located in a Latin American context where similar incidences were occurring in neighbouring countries. The authors also note how US anti-communist rhetoric only served to sharpen the political violence, rather than incubate it.

The historiography is ample and far reaching, with the coup receiving much attention from both historians of Chile and its politics, and those from outside this field (principally historians of US foreign policy and government agencies). Existing literature appears to leave no stone unturned in deciphering the events of 11 September 1973. Some focus on the particular, the questions of who, what, where and when, while others take a *longue durée* approach, stressing the importance of historical and geographical context. Regardless of the focus taken, it is clear that various political actors and dynamics – both domestic and international – contributed to what was a very complex political process. What is missing from existing literature, however, is any concrete attempt to locate the coup's importance to the recent history and trajectory of contemporary capitalism. In other words, the coup has failed to be read as a crucial juncture that paved the way for the neoliberal project. This is in some way

rectified by a small number of academics concerned with the history of contemporary capitalism.

In the previous chapter, it was explored how historians and social scientists alike broadly recognise that neoliberal capitalism is a distinct form of capitalism that emerged and replaced a previous form (labelled 'post-war consensus capitalism' by this thesis, among others) in the mid to late 1970s and early 1980s. One stark issue with that literature is that the "ground zero" moment of neoliberalism is not identified. In other words, no political process is identified as being *the* process that sparked the capitalist renewal. This thesis understands the 1973 coup as being that process. This perspective builds upon a small yet burgeoning group of work that has sought to establish the embryonic stages of the neoliberal project. Particularly instructive on this is Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine* (2007). Klein writes that Chile was Milton Friedman's (the architect of this new form of capitalism) 'first laboratory' (*ibid.*: 166) for his radical, free market economic theories, and that the coup allowed his disciples (the "Chicago boys" – Chilean students who had gone to the University of Chicago to study under Friedman) to implement these theories. Klein spends much time detailing the violence enacted by the Chilean state upon its citizens and writes how the brutal oppression of the Pinochet-led junta allowed for this new form of economics to be fully installed. This is important because what Klein is doing is implying that the brutal violence of the State was necessary, not just to solidify the Junta's rule, but to transform the Chilean social body in order for this new economic system to take hold. She then goes on to discuss how the Chilean model of political "shock" (military coup followed by repression) followed by economic "shock" (radical free market economic policy) was mimicked across the globe – first in other Latin American states, then in the former Soviet bloc. She quotes Argentine sociologist Daniel Feierstein: 'extermination in Argentina…is the systematic destruction of a "substantial part" of the Argentine national group, intended to transform the group as such, to redefine its way of being, its social relations, its fate, its future' (*ibid.*: 203). As Klein writes earlier in the book about Chile, 'the entire country had gotten the message: resistance is deadly' (*ibid.*: 160).

This notion that a fundamental component of the neoliberal project is the reconfiguration of the social body and subjectivity chimes strongly with the conclusions of the previous chapter. Drawing together this understanding of neoliberalism with the 1973 coup, Klein identifies the coup as that "ground zero" moment, or process, that paved the way for the neoliberal project. Klein is not alone in this. This point is also shared by Oscar Guardiola-Rivera in *Story of a Death Foretold*:

> 'There is…a connection between the semblance of legality constructed under states of exception, insecurity or emergency – such as the one that came into existence in Chile after 11 September 1973, declared in order to contain alleged existential threats and restore socio-economic normalcy – and the establishment of market cultures where once stood more creative and affirmative societies' (Guardiola-Rivera 2013: 337)

It would be wrong to suggest that all works pertaining to the histories of neoliberalism, or of capitalism more broadly, reach the same insights as Klein and Guardiola-Rivera. Important works in the field such as Harvey's *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2007), Burgin's *The Great Persuasion* (2015) and Steadman Jones' *Masters of the Universe* (2012) – all historical

accounts of the neoliberal project – downplay the importance of the Chilean experience to neoliberalism. This thesis, however, very much shares the insights of Klein and Guardiola-Rivera, positioning the 1973 coup as the moment that allowed for neoliberalism's key architects – in this case, Milton Friedman and the "Chicago boys" – to install an economic, political and social project in Chile to serve as a test case. The next section explores Pinochet's subsequent rule, examining the neoliberal foundation to his regime and the lasting effect that it has had on Chile today.

iv. Pinochet's Chile

It is important to now provide a brief historical summary of Pinochet's rule in order to establish key moments throughout his tenure as head of state, while simultaneously justifying his administration as the first neoliberal one in the world. These key moments serve as the focal points around which the source material for analysis in chapters four through eight are drawn. The regime was installed following the 1973 coup. As established previously, this was a complex process that was prepared for through the destabilising actions of different parts of the Chilean elite, in concert with their Washington allies. Following the coup, the regime's rule in its immediate aftermath can be accurately described as one of violent repression. The coup was justified by the junta and sympathetic voices within Chile as being necessary to prevent the country becoming a communist state (Gallardo November 26th 2006; Long September 9th 2013). As such, following the coup, the regime's efforts were focused solely on weeding out a supposed "red threat". Parties involved in the UP coalition were outlawed and driven underground. The 1925 constitution was suspended, and the country was placed into a state of emergency (Dorfman 2006).

The Chilean economy was still suffering from rampant inflation and food shortages following the coup. It was not until 1975 that Pinochet and his junta decided to take concrete action to remedy this, by appointing that group of neoliberal Chilean economists to his cabinet – the Chicago Boys (Valdés 2008). It is from this point that Chile begins its neoliberal transformation in earnest. Despite being appointed two years after the coup, it would be wrong to say that the appointment of the Chicago Boys came out of the blue. In fact, while remaining on the fringes of Chilean political and economic thought during the 1960s and 1970s, they had attempted to establish their influence prior to the coup. In 1972, some of said economists wrote a book called *El Ladrillo*, or, *The Brick*; a large text detailing the plans and policies the Chicago Boys would enact in order to transform the Chilean economy, if they were to be given the chance (De Castro 1992). They got that chance in the mid to late 1970s, when the Chilean economy was radically and rapidly transformed from one of government intervention to one of deregulation, privatisation, tax cuts and interest rate hikes (*ibid.*). Immediately, unemployment soared, and the economy slid into recession. The economy did begin to recover in the late 1970s, however, and the story of Chile's neoliberal experiment began to spread to sympathetic international voices. This is particularly evident in chapter four in which the source material from *The Economist* is analysed. The period of the mid/late 1970s to the early 1980s in Chile is referred to by this thesis as Chile's pure neoliberalism. This is because the near-full extent of *El Ladrillo* – a neoliberal handbook for Chile's economy – was implemented. The neoliberal turn was then concretised in Chile's legal and institutional frameworks in 1980, when the junta drafted and ratified a new constitution to replace the 1925 one which was suspended following the coup. The 1980 constitution was not just an

attempt to further consolidate the junta's power, rather it was also a method of imprinting on Chile its new neoliberal orientation. In fact, the constitution itself was commonly referred to as the 'Constitution of Liberty,' a moniker borrowed from neoliberal theorist Friedrich Hayek's 1960 book of the same name (Ensalaco 1999: 179; Barros 2002: 255). Given this landmark moment in Chile's political, economic and legal history, the period of the drafting and ratification of the new constitution (1979-1980) is selected as one period for analysis in this thesis.

Chile's political situation remained unchanged in the early 1980s. The constitution confirmed Pinochet's status as head of state and guaranteed him a stay in office until at least 1988, opposition parties were outlawed, and the use of state violence and repression continued. The economic situation, however, changed dramatically in 1982 when the Latin American debt crisis emerged. By the beginning of the 1980s, Chile's economic situation had started to recover somewhat from the economic woes of the early to mid 1970s. Supporters of the regime and its neoliberal programme put this down to the economic reforms. Friedman called the economic upturn, 'the miracle of Chile' (Klein 2007: 170). The 1982 debt crisis put an end to that, as Chile was badly hit by an economic slump that swept through Latin America. Chile's recovery began at the mid-point of the decade, following the appointment of Hernán Büchi as Finance Minister in 1985. Büchi, a Chicago Boy, brought a subtle yet important change to the state's economic policymaking. While being deeply committed to the fundamentals of the neoliberal project, Büchi's appointment nonetheless marked the beginning of what this thesis calls Chile's pragmatic neoliberalism. In order to emerge from the crisis, Büchi's plan involved further privatisations and tax cuts coupled with state intervention (albeit limited) in the import/export sectors through strategic tariffs and subsidies, and through stricter banking regulation (González 2008). This is a significant point in Chile's recent political and economic history as it designates a complication to the idea that Pinochet's rule was one of unrelenting free-market dogmatism. While the state did not reverse its neoliberal direction (which was firmly imprinted by the 1980 constitution), it did soften its adherence to market fundamentalism. This further adds credence to the idea that neoliberalism is not simply defined by a certain suite of economic policies but is related also to modalities of governance and jurisprudence (explored in depth in the previous chapter). Considering the importance of Büchi's appointment as Finance Minister, the years 1984-1985 (identified broadly as a period when Chile's economic fortunes began to change) are selected as another period for analysis.

The remainder of the 1980s was characterised by a lightening of the political repression and an improving of the economic situation. On the political front, an anti-junta opposition was legally recognised by the state and was allowed to mobilise peaceful opposition campaigns in the run up to the 1988 plebiscite. The PS was legalised after it officially abandoned violent opposition to the junta and joined forces with the PDC, while the PCCh remained a proscribed group under the terms of the constitution (Loveman Winter 1986-1987). The national poll, mandated by the 1980 constitution, petitioned the people for an extension of Pinochet's military rule for a further decade. The resulting 'No' vote set the country on the path to a resumption of liberal democracy. The first presidential election since 1970 was held in 1989, and the winning candidate – the PDC candidate Patricio Aylwin – was inaugurated in early 1990, bringing to an end 17 years of military rule. The influence and legacy of Pinochet and his junta's rule did not cease in 1990, however. The country's democratic transition was profoundly shaped by the dictator's own 1980 constitution. A third of the upper house of the

Chilean legislature was reserved for military appointees so that the outgoing junta could maintain a tight control over the state. Parties of the radical Left remained banned (forcing the Left to soften its rhetoric and policies in order to legally exist) and the neoliberal fundamentals of the economy remained untouchable, entrenched in the constitution (Fernández & Vera 2012). Thus, the post-1990 democratic Chile bears little political or economic semblance to the democratic Chile of pre-1973. The Chilean business community now wields immense political power while Chilean civil society remains weak by comparison (Luna & Mardones 2010). Chile's new democratic form maintains a political system that is increasingly managed and negotiated at an elite level, in which calls for serious change are rendered impotent through civil society's detachment from political institutions (Nef 2003). Thus, the momentous events of the transition have achieved cosmetic but not systemic political and economic changes. Again, considering the importance of the transition to Chile's history, the years 1990-1991 (the first two years of Aylwin's presidency) are selected for analysis in this thesis.

Pinochet's spectre over Chile did not cease until his death in 2006. Until 2002 he held the position of Senator for Life in the Chilean legislature. Major political discussion around Pinochet and his legacy erupted in the late 1990s when the ex-dictator was indicted for human rights abuses by Spanish magistrate Baltasar Garzón in October 1998 and was then arrested in London six days later. The case dominated public discourse in both Chile and the United Kingdom. After much legal wrangling in the British judicial system, Pinochet was released back to Chile in 2000 on health grounds. He surrendered his position of Senator for Life and up until his death was regularly indicted for various crimes by Chilean legal authorities. The case in London brought back to the surface the importance of Pinochet to the neoliberal project, as his once close political ally and continued friend, Margaret Thatcher, often pleaded for his release and safe passage back to Chile (*BBC News* November 25th 1998; *BBC News* March 26th 1999; Gardner 22nd September 2015). The case itself has been labelled, 'one of the most dramatic moments in twentieth-century international law' (Wuerth 2012: 731). As such, the years of the case in London (1998-99) are selected as the end point for this research's analysis.

This brief historical review of Chile's economic and political history since the 1973 coup has highlighted several key moments and processes. These are the ratification of the 1980 constitution; the appointment of Hernán Büchi as Finance Minister in 1985 (and the subsequent change in economic policy); the inauguration of the first democratically-elected President since 1973, Patricio Aylwin, in 1990; and the indictment of Pinochet in London in 1998. Together with the two political processes discussed in previous sections of this chapter (the election of Salvador Allende in 1970 and his subsequent removal from office via military coup in 1973), this thesis has six key events, and thus six date ranges, around which the analysis of the source material is structured. These are 1970-71, 1973-74, 1979-80, 1984-85, 1990-91 and 1998-99. These dates are selected due to their importance to Chile's history. However, as is evidenced in the following section, these dates also hold significance in British history. The following summary adds weight to the decision to select the aforementioned dates as the loci around which the analysis is structured while also justifying the decision to analyse Chile's neoliberal turn through a British lens, given the remarkable similarities in the political and economic trajectories of the two countries over this time period. What is demonstrated below is that many of the processes the British Left witnessed from afar in

Chile between 1970 and 1999 were similar to ones being experienced by those groups on home soil.

v. UK politics, 1970-1999

It is also useful, therefore, to provide a summary of UK politics during the period under analysis (1970 – 1999). This subsection adds further justification for using UK actors as a lens through which the Chilean neoliberal turn is analysed, while simultaneously adding justification to the selection of the date ranges listed above around which the analysis in this thesis takes place. As is demonstrated in the following section, there is remarkable similarity and complementarity between the histories of the UK and Chile across the 1970-1999 period. In 1970, Ted Heath was elected Prime Minister. A Conservative, Heath's victory, and particularly the margin of the victory, came as somewhat of a surprise. The Conservative Party campaign had been dogged by allegations from Labour that Heath had a secret plan for the economy that involved multiple privatisations and deregulation (Garnett 2005). Despite this, Heath overcame unfavourable opinion polling and gained a majority in the House of Commons. In spite of the Conservatives' victory, Heath abandoned his proto-neoliberal economic programme and reverted to the established doctrine of the day – Keynesianism. The reversion to Keynesianism was most notable in 1972, when the UK went through a period of economic decline. This decline was the direct result of the "Nixon shock" and subsequent oil crises, and was a decline shared by much of the Western world (De Long 1997). With both inflation and unemployment on the rise, Heath and his Chancellor Anthony Barber pumped billions into the economy. This classic Keynesian prescription for an ailing economy – counter-cyclical spending – sparked a recovery that is often referred to as 'the Barber Boom' (Campbell 2008; Steele 2010; Sloman 2016). The fundamentals of the post-war consensus economy (nationalised industry, focus on full employment and a broad welfare state) remained untouched under the Heath government.

At first glance, this period of British political and economic history does not appear to hold many similarities with goings on in Chile. In the UK, a right-wing government was elected in 1970; in Chile, a left-wing one. However, the bases of the UK and Chilean economies do bear a resemblance during this period. The economies certainly were "mixed", comprised of state-ownership of key industries alongside a substantial private sector. What's more, government intervention in the economy provided for a welfare state (in the UK it was a well-established welfare state; in Chile it was fledgling). The UP and Heath governments also shared a fractious relationship with the trade union movement (a relationship which many believe was a contributing factor in the downfall of the Heath government in 1974 (Dorey 1995; Holmes 1997; Phillips 2006; Taylor 2013)). Therefore, while the respective governments may appear to have been polar opposites ideologically, both the UK and Chile experienced a similar economic orientation in the early 1970s. Of course, these similarities must not be overstated, and the turbulence experienced by the Heath government (such as the miners' strikes of 1972 and 1974) pale in comparison to the near-chaos experienced by Salvador Allende. Nevertheless, the commonalities highlighted here add further weight to the selection of the date range of 1970-71 for analysis. This is because it means that the issues that the groups under analysis were grappling with at home were similar to the ones they witnessed and sought to understand in Chile. Furthermore, the end of the Heath government in 1974 adds further justification for selecting 1973-74 as a range for analysis. By 1974, the 'Barber Boom'

had come to an end and the UK was once again facing an economic slump. Heath called a general election against the backdrop of industrial unrest and an ailing economy. The election in February of that year returned a hung Parliament. A subsequent election was held in October, in which Harold Wilson, leader of the Labour Party and formerly Prime Minister (1964-1970) duly secured a majority (Childs 2001; Ball 2013). Further similarities between the UK and Chile emerge here. Both countries witnessed governmental changes 11 months apart against the backdrop of economic turbulence. Once again, it is vitally important to refrain from overstating the similarities between the two countries (Chile's experience was all the more violent and complex than the UK's), however the goings-on in British politics at this time add further justification to selecting 1973-74 as a date range for analysis.

The trajectories of Chile and the UK diverge after 1973-74. By the time of the 1974 UK general election, Chile was one year into the suspension of democracy and military control. The UK, of course, remained a parliamentary democracy. Chile's neoliberal turn began in earnest in 1975 following the appointment of the 'Chicago Boys' to Pinochet's cabinet. In the meantime, the Wilson government maintained the UK's commitment to post-war consensus capitalism by expanding government spending to counteract the economic downturn (Holmes 1985). Wilson's successor, Jim Callaghan, also maintained his party's commitment to such an economic agenda (*ibid.*). The UK's neoliberal turn only occurred following the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979. By the 1979 election, the UK's economy was in major turmoil, as the country suffered the infamous 'Winter of Discontent' of 1978/79. Though the efficacy of the Labour government's policies to deal with the crisis are hotly contested (Hay 2009), politically the damage was done. Margaret Thatcher was elected on a platform that promised to control inflation (signalling a move away from the party's longstanding commitment to full employment (Blake 2012)) and to curb the power of the trade unions, which had been staging a series of strikes across different sectors of the economy throughout the late 1970s (Reitan 2003). Thatcher's attacks on the unions and on inflation began almost immediately. Unemployment continued to climb upwards, but the government refused to revert to the Keynesian doctrine of spending (*ibid.*).

By the end of the 1970s it thus appears Chile and the UK have diverged. Nonetheless, this does not undermine the selection of 1979-80 as a period for analysis. While the neoliberal turn in the UK was only just beginning, in Chile it was being cemented, as Pinochet ratified his new constitution one year after Thatcher's election. Thatcher's neoliberal drive accelerated following her re-election in 1983, as her government embarked upon a widespread privatisation programme. The selling off of state-owned housing began in 1980, and the state's heavy industry assets followed suit with the 1983 budget. High levels of unemployment endured, yet the government's focus remained on inflation, curbing trade union rights and cutting state expenditure. The government's disputes with the trade union movement came to a head with the seminal miners' strike of 1984-85. The National Mineworkers' Union (NUM) was, in the 1980s, one of the most powerful unions in the country, and a strike was announced in 1984 to try to prevent the widespread closure of the UK's coal mining industry (Taylor 2005). The NUM had a strong record in achieving its goals through industrial action and was responsible for destabilising the Heath government in 1974 (*ibid.*). The miners' strike is now largely understood by historians as part of a wider ideological battle between Thatcher's neoliberalism and the UK's industrial past (Paterson 2014). The government's victory – and therefore the NUM's defeat – can therefore be seen as a decisive

victory for neoliberalism in the United Kingdom as it strengthened the state's position in further pursuing labour and economic reforms (Hencke & Beckett 2009). As such, the years 1984-85 have added significance for analysis as the miners' strike is understood by this thesis as the moment when neoliberalism "won", seeing off its greatest challenge in the guise of organised labour.

The end of Thatcher's premiership came in 1990, the same year that Pinochet was replaced by a democratically elected President in Chile. It is at this point that the histories of Chile and the UK seem to realign as the two heads of state associated with their respective country's neoliberal turns vacate office within months of each other. Despite their replacement, however, the neoliberal legacies of Pinochet and Thatcher persisted through their successors. The political change in Chile was, once again, starker as the country transitioned from military dictatorship to liberal democracy, whereas in the UK one Conservative Prime Minister was replaced by another (John Major). Thatcher was forced to resign due to major popular revolt against her proposed Poll Tax (a replacement for the existing Council Tax, and one that was perceived by many to be disproportionately punitive against poorer communities (Burns 1992; Bagguley 1995)). Despite the ignominy of her downfall, and despite the Major ministry's decision to scrap the Poll Tax, Thatcher's successor maintained the neoliberal reorientation of the country (Reitan 2003). There is a quite clear commonality here with the Chilean experience, as despite Pinochet's replacement with a democratically elected centrist candidate (Patricio Aylwin of the PDC), the new democratic government maintained the neoliberal foundation of the country that was established by the ageing dictator (Bresnahan 2003). Indeed the 1980 constitution, which provided a legal institutionalisation of neoliberalism, was left largely untouched (as is the case even today). Thus, in both countries in the early 1990s great political change may have occurred, but that change was, in many ways, cosmetic as the neoliberal hue of both countries remained intact. This adds further justification for the selection of 1990-91 as a date range for analysis.

The end date range for this analysis is 1998-99, which has been selected due to the shared experience Chile and the UK had over the indictment and house arrest of Pinochet in London during this time. This in itself provides adequate justification for the selection of this date range. However, further weight is added when the broader political context of the UK is taken into consideration. By this time, the Labour Party had been elected to government under Tony Blair's leadership with a landslide electoral win in 1997. Despite the change in party, however, the Blair premiership is often understood as a continuation of neoliberal fundamentals, albeit with increased spending on welfare (Reitan 2003). Despite that increase in state expenditure, Blair increased marketisation in the public sector, did not re-nationalise any of the Conservative governments' privatisations, and maintained a keen distance from the trade union movement (Shaw 2007; Jobson & Wickham-Jones 2011). Labour under Blair, therefore, was not a return to the Labour of the post-war consensus years of the 1970s and before, rather it was a continuation of many of the neoliberal practices of the preceding Conservative governments. This holds much similarity with the PDC presidencies of Patricio Aylwin (1990-1994) and Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle (1994-2000) who maintained Pinochet's neoliberalism, albeit with increases in welfare spending (Bresnahan 2003).

This brief review of UK politics between 1970 and 1999 has served a dual purpose. Firstly, it justifies the decision to analyse Chile's neoliberal turn under Pinochet from a UK lens and

context. The review has established numerous commonalities between the historical trajectories of Chile and the UK between 1970 and 1999, elucidating the mirrored paths each country embarked upon across this time frame. Both countries' histories can broadly be divided into three parts: firstly, the end of Keynesian-inspired state management of the economy and civil society, which occurred in Chile between 1970 and 1973, and in the UK between 1970 and 1979; secondly, the neoliberal turn, which in Chile was steered by dictator Augusto Pinochet between 1973 and 1990, and was undertaken in the UK by Margaret Thatcher between 1979 and 1990; and thirdly, neoliberal continuation, a process of maintaining the course in light of political changes post-1990. This historical overview has also added justification for the date ranges that have been selected for analysis (1970-71, 1973-74, 1979-80, 1984-85, 1990-91 and 1998-99). The above section highlights key events that occurred in the UK, aligning with key events that occurred in Chile in the same time periods that were discussed in previous sections. Overall, what this establishes is that the groups under analysis in this thesis – parties and organisations of Britain's anti-capitalist Left – were experiencing similar processes at home to the ones they were witnessing and attempting to analyse in Chile. The next chapter, in which the research design and methodology are explained in depth, discusses the structuring of the analysis around these date ranges. First, however, it is important to explore the subjects under analysis: political parties of the anti-capitalist Left in the United Kingdom that were active between 1970 and 1999. This occurs in the following section.

vi. The British Left

This thesis' source material is drawn from publications (newspapers and theoretical journals) of left-wing political groups operating in the UK between 1970 and 1999. In order to establish which groups are chosen to be used as source material, and to justify why looking at the Left in the UK is worthwhile in this thesis, a short historiography of the British Left is needed. This thesis uses the term 'Left' to refer to those groups broadly positioned as anti-capitalist Left. The decision is taken to focus on the anti-capitalist Left as the research is concerned with the failed contestation of a new ideological regime (neoliberalism). Given the discursive premise of this study, the analysis focusses on this institution and contestation through political discourse. Specifically, these case-analyses focus on political discourse that occurs *outside* "official" political institutions. "Official" here refers to government institutions, such as Parliament and councils, and the elections that generate them, as well as the political parties that take part in these institutions (i.e. parties that were represented in said institutions having successfully navigated the electoral process). This is done for two reasons. Firstly, all of the main political parties involved in British politics during the period of inquiry (the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s) are widely recognised as being part of the same ideological structure. None of the political parties that had electoral success during this period are recognised as being anti-capitalist. Even the party of the Left that was represented at an institutional level – the Labour Party – was not an anti-capitalist party (Callaghan 1990; Laybourn 2000, 2006; Smith & Worley 2014). As has previously been established in this thesis, while the Labour Party was certainly anti-neoliberal in the 1970s and early 1980s, its ideological platform was premised broadly around Keynesian doctrine and protection and continuation of the post-war consensus, identified in this thesis as another form of capitalism. Furthermore, the Labour Party transformed into a party that supported neoliberal fundamentals in the 1990s (the era known as "New Labour" (Reitan 2003)). As such, when it comes to the contestation of

neoliberal ideology, contestation with the aim of replacing capitalism in its entirety did not take place at an "official" institutional level. Hence the decision to study contestation from non-institutional actors.

The history of the British Left is a varied and complex one. Many groups on the Left have had major influence in key political processes in the 20th century, yet only one organisation – the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) – has ever had electoral success, and even that success was limited. The CPGB itself was the largest left-wing party to the left of the Labour Party (Beckett 1995). Formed in 1920, the party quickly established itself as the pre-eminent communist party in the UK, being officially anointed as such by Vladimir Lenin (Eaden & Renton 2002). The party maintained close ties with Moscow throughout its history and at times rivalled the Labour Party for influence in the UK trade union movement (Hinton 1983). Despite its name and its association with the Soviet Union's revolutionary forefather, the CPGB was not an insurrectionary party. It's platform – enshrined in the programme *Britain's Road to Socialism* – committed the party to engaging in parliamentary democracy and achieving a socialist UK through institutional means. This places the party on remarkably similar ground to the UP, and particularly the PCCh, which was ostensibly committed to achieving the same ends via the same means (Furci 1984). The height of the CPGB's strength was the 1930s to the 1950s, twenty years in which all of the party's MPs were elected and in which the membership of the party was at its peak (Eaden & Renton 2002). The party entered into a period of gradual decline from the late 1960s onwards when anti-Soviet sentiment was growing both in the political mainstream and on the Left (Beckett 1995). The CPGB gradually broke up through the 1980s as the party's leadership finally abandoned Soviet orthodoxy and adopted a much more democratic socialist ideological orientation known as Eurocommunism (*ibid.*). The party finally dissolved in 1991. However, the party's newspaper, *Morning Star*, continues to live on to this day, having officially de-affiliated from the party in the mid-1980s (Howe 2001). As such, *Morning Star* is one of the newspapers that is used as source material throughout the entire 1970-1999 period. The party's theoretical journal *Marxism Today*, folded with the party in 1991 as it was closely aligned with the Eurocommunist wing that dissolved the CPGB. Nevertheless, *Marxism Today* is also used as source material for the years 1970-1991.

The CPGB's main adversaries on the Left were Trotskyist groups, and indeed the UK's Left has long had a strong Trotskyist tradition (Laybourn 2006). One of the most influential of such groups is the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), which changed to its current name from the International Socialists in 1977 (as such, the group is hereby referred to as IS/SWP in this thesis). Unlike the CPGB, IS/SWP has rarely participated in British parliamentary elections[6] and has forever been committed to revolution as political strategy (Cliff 2000a). The group was formed around anti-capitalist critiques of the Soviet Union, specifically Tony Cliff's analysis of the Soviet Union as a state capitalist regime (Smith & Worley 2014). As such, the group was formed in direct opposition to the CPGB's affiliation with Moscow and it rivalled the CPGB for influence on the Left. IS/SWP had a strong period of influence in the trade union movement during the early 1970s, a period when the CPGB's influence was slowly waning

[6] The party has very occasionally stood candidates in nationwide elections, such as two by-elections in 1976 (Walsall North and Newcastle-upon-Tyne Central) but, due to poor results, the party's leadership decided from that point to never again participate in elections as a standalone entity (Cliff 2000b). In more recent times, the party has stood in elections as part of electoral pacts, such as Socialist Alliance (between 1992 and 2005) and R.E.S.P.E.C.T. (between 2004 and 2007).

(*ibid.*). However, by the time Margaret Thatcher was elected in 1979, the party's leadership took the decision to downscale the operations and activities of the group, refocussing it towards a more propagandist role (*ibid.*). As such, the party's newspaper, *Socialist Worker*, and the party's theoretical journal, *International Socialism*, became prominent mouthpieces for anti-Thatcher propaganda. Following the dissolution of the CPGB in the early 1990s, IS/SWP has emerged once again as a leading organisation on Britain's Left, taking a prominent role in large campaigning organisations such as the Stop the War Coalition (Boothroyd 2001). The party continues to be an organising force on the British Left today and its two publications are still in circulation. Therefore, both of these publications are used as source material between 1970 and 1999.

Another key group on the Trotskyist Left was Militant, commonly known as Militant Tendency. Another adherent to revolutionary praxis, Militant adopted slightly different tactics to IS/SWP and focussed their efforts on entryism within the Labour party, with the aim to take control and reform the Labour Party as a revolutionary socialist organisation (Smith & Worley 2014). Militant's peak years, so to speak, coincided with Michael Foot's leadership of the Labour Party (1980-83). Foot, perhaps the most left-wing leader of the Labour Party in the post-war years (Crines 2011), faced multiple accusations of facilitating and appeasing Militant throughout his leadership (Smith & Worley 2014). The group was particularly influential in Liverpool in the early 1980s, and Liverpool city council (which was Labour-controlled) officially adopted Militant policies around this time (including passing an illegal budget in deficit in 1982 (Taaffe & Mulhearn 2017)). Militant even had two of its supporters elected as Labour MPs in 1983 – Dave Nellist and Terry Fields (Smith & Worley 2014). Militant also played a key role in organising Poll Tax rebellions in the late 1980s (*ibid.*). The group's influence and prominence quickly waned as Foot's successor, Neil Kinnock, embarked upon a campaign to weed out the group from the party and the organisation was eventually wound up in 1991 (*ibid.*). Considering the relative importance of Militant to British left-wing history, the group's eponymous newspaper *Militant* is also used as source material from 1970-1991.

The Trotskyist group International Marxist Group (IMG) is also under analysis in this research. IMG spun out of the CPGB in the 1950s and was the official British section of the Fourth International (FI). The group itself was much more of a propagandist vehicle than the others already covered in this section (Burton-Cartledge 2014). As a group, its membership was relatively low in numbers compared to rival organisations on the Trotskyist Left (such as IS/SWP and Militant), however it did have some very high-profile members including left-wing journalist Tariq Ali. Its newspaper was in regular publication throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, despite going through numerous name and organisational changes (it was launched as *The Black Dwarf* in 1968, changed its name to *Red Mole* in 1970, *Red Weekly* in 1973, *Socialist Challenge* in 1977, and finally *Socialist Action* in 1982 (Alexander 1991)). IMG was involved in many international solidarity campaigns, particularly in the 1970s, and many of the newspaper's contributors also regularly contributed to the FI's international journal *Intercontinental Press*. As such, both the IMG's newspaper and *Intercontinental Press* are selected for analysis in this research. The group folded in 1982, and as such, the newspaper (which folded soon after) will only provide source material up until that year. *Intercontinental Press*, however, continued to exist up until 1986 and thus can provide further material up until that point.

There is also a significant journal that necessitates inclusion in this research due to its importance to left-wing intellectuality in the UK, and the critiques it offered to the predominance of Marxist-Leninist groups on the British Left – *New Left Review. New Left Review* has always been non-aligned to any particular political party or organisation. Its contributors have been varied, including members of lots of different, often competing, left-wing organisations. The journal was founded in 1960 and emerged as part of the broad 'New Left' political movement which rejected established forms of Marxist theory (including Soviet Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism) and was critical of the Soviet Union (Birchall 1980; Lin 1993). Its contributors have included illustrious names on the Left, including Tariq Ali, E. P. Thompson, Perry Anderson, Terry Eagleton and Robin Blackburn, among others (Lin 1993). *New Left Review*'s inclusion not only provides more material for analysis in the 1990s (as the journal continues to exist, unlike the majority of publications analysed in this research), but it also adds diversity to the content of the material analysed. This thesis treats the Left in the UK as a relatively homogenous bloc. That is by its very nature a controversial decision. As demonstrated already in this section, the groups of the British Left espoused varying ideologies (with a notable division between Soviet Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism) and adopted varying political strategies (including parliamentary politics, entryism and protest). The *New Left Review* adds a further dimension to this as its intellectual context was born out of a general rejection of the established parties of the Left. Nevertheless, this thesis is not primarily concerned with the internal schisms and divisions of UK left-wing politics and seeks instead to understand the Left as a broad collection of actors unified by one facet – anti-capitalism[7]. The research seeks to understand the discursive procedures involved in the failed contestation of neoliberalism at the very moments of its imposition in both Chile and the United Kingdom. Looking at diverse groups and publications of the Left allows for an analysis that rises above internecine and sectarian division and seeks to tease out any commonalities in discourse between the varied Left groups and publications, seeking to answer how and why the Left failed *as a whole*. The inclusion of *New Left Review* therefore adds a further dimension to this totality of the analysis between 1970 and 1999.

The overriding issue with the source material selected for analysis in this thesis is that many of the publications ceased to exist when their associated organisations folded. This is the case for the majority of the publications in question and only *The Morning Star, International Socialism, Socialist Worker* and *New Left Review* remain in publication today. As such, it is necessary to bolster the material available for analysis by including another group (and thus another newspaper) that continues to exist today. The group selected is the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG), and its newspaper *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!*. The RCG is a much smaller group than many of those under analysis and was formed in 1974 as a split from IS/SWP. As it is a small group, its paper is published with less frequency than others (typically once a month). Nevertheless, it continues in circulation today and as the name of the publication reflects, the group has often been involved in international solidarity campaigns. Therefore, the publication is selected as suitable for analysis in this research, considering the content of the newspaper is often dedicated to foreign affairs.

[7] It is important to affirm at this juncture that this thesis does not seek to equate Marxism-Leninism or 'New Left' Marxism with anti-capitalism. The decision has been taken to exclude libertarian socialist and anarchist groups from this study due to the fact that such groups have had a relatively small "footprint" on British left-wing politics compared to those studied in this research project (Smith & Worley 2014)

The list of publications under analysis in this research is therefore as follows: *The Morning Star,* and *Marxism Today* (CPGB); *Socialist Worker* and *International Socialism* (IS/SWP); *Militant* (Militant Tendency); *The Black Dwarf/Red Mole/Red Weekly/Socialist Challenge/Socialist Action* and *Intercontinental Press* (IMG); *New Left Review* (no affiliation); and *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* (RCG). These groups have been selected due to their relative importance and prominence in the history of British left-wing anti-capitalist politics in the 20th and 21st centuries. They have not been chosen according to strategy, ideology or internal party structures and represent a varied cross-section of the British anti-capitalist Left. It must be noted at this point that this thesis does not read anti-capitalism as synonymous with Marxism-Leninism (and its variations/derivations) or New Left Marxism, the doctrine of the far-left groups under study in this research project. Anarchist and libertarian socialist organisations are excluded in this research due to the fact that such groups have had a relatively small "footprint" on British anti-capitalist politics in comparison to organisations studied in this research. Though there have been occasions when anarchist and left-libertarian groups have had a more significant impact on British politics (such as during the anti-poll tax protests in 1989-1990 (Cross 2014)), the British far-left "scene" was dominated by Marxism-Leninism throughout the 20th century, and faced its largest "challenge" from the Left with the emergence of the New Left in the 1960s (Smith & Worley 2014). Hence the decision is taken to focus squarely on Marxist-Leninist and New Left publications. The following chapter details the design and methodology of this research, articulating the manner in which source material is drawn and analysed. Before that, however, it is first important to discuss the rationale behind the selection of the right-wing pro-neoliberal test case, *The Economist*, which is explored in the following section.

vii. *The Economist*

The Economist has been selected in this thesis to provide a test case against which left-wing anti-capitalist discourse can be compared and contrasted with right-wing discourse that broadly supported the neoliberal turn in Chile and the UK. *The Economist* is therefore selected by this thesis to provide a test case due to its support for the neoliberal project. *The Economist* is also selected along the same rationale as the selection of non-institutional source material from the Left. As the decision has been taken to analyse discourse from outside official institutions, so too it is right that the right-wing test case also comes from the non-institutional arena, thereby precluding the selection of publications associated with organisations with institutional influence (such as the journals of neoliberal think tanks). Furthermore, *The Economist* has also been selected for its stature among pro-capitalist media outlets. This requires further elaboration. As this subsection details, this British weekly newsmagazine is selected due to its ideological position, its influence and its content.

Academic histories and analyses of *The Economist* are surprisingly few. In fact, the only comprehensive history of the publication is *The Pursuit of Reason: The Economist, 1843-1993*. *The Economist* commissioned Irish writer Ruth Dudley Edwards to write a comprehensive history of the news magazine to commemorate its 150th anniversary in 1993. As such, even the authoritative comprehensive history of the newsmagazine lacks a certain objective and critical rigour (Spence 1995), and in any case only covers the publication's history up until 1993. Nevertheless, Dudley Edwards' monograph does provide valuable insight into the rationale and motivations for *The Economist*'s founding. As the author writes, 'it's purpose

was to further the case of free trade in the interests of national and international prosperity' (Dudley Edwards 1995: 1-2). Founded by James Wilson, a Scottish economist and Liberal Party politician, *The Economist* was, from the outset, devoted to defending and advancing the liberal tradition in politics and economics. Its founder was greatly influenced by the classical liberal economists Adam Smith and David Ricardo (*ibid.*). That raison d'être persists to this day, as *The Economist* continues to strike an editorial line that is devoted to the key tenets of classical liberal thought. This is particularly evident when looking at the endorsements the publication has given to Prime Ministerial candidates in UK general elections. The publication has overwhelmingly favoured either the Liberal Democrats (and their Liberal Party predecessors) or the Conservative party at election time (*ibid.*), although it notably endorsed Tony Blair's Labour Party in 2005 (*The Economist* April 28th 2005). The publication has repeatedly advocated in favour of free market economics, deregulation, and privatisation, and is still an unrepentant supporter of Margaret Thatcher's premiership, praising her liberalisation of financial markets and trade in particular (*The Economist* April 13th 2013). As Karl Marx once wrote, *The Economist* is 'the European organ of the aristocracy of finance' (Marx 2006: 189). Lenin also labelled the newsmagazine, 'a journal that speaks for the British millionaires' (Lenin 1974: 192).

Despite the dearth of material available on the newsmagazine, the influence of the publication can be inferred by looking at key figures involved in it throughout its history. Specifically relating to the period under analysis in this research (1970-1999), *The Economist* over this time had four editors: Sir Alastair Burnet (1965-1974), Andrew Knight (1974-1986), Rupert Pennant-Rea (1986-1993) and Bill Emmott (1993-2006). All four have held numerous high-ranking positions in different media groups and other non-media private corporations throughout their careers. Following his stint at *The Economist*, Burnet became a board member of ITN (*Irish Independent* July 29th 2012). Both Knight and Pennant-Rea went on to hold directorship positions in different parts of Rupert Murdoch's media empire (Greenslade March 2nd 2011; O'Carroll September 13th 2012). Emmot was formerly on the content board at media regulator Ofcom (Conlan September 13th 2016). The careers of these editors provide a snapshot into the esteem with which an editorship at *The Economist* is held in media and non-media circles. The relationship between the Murdoch empire and Knight and Pennant-Rea also highlights the ideological convictions of those who are put in charge of this influential newsmagazine (indeed it says a lot that none of the listed former editors have gone on to hold positions at centre-left publications or media groups). *The Economist* also has a remarkably high level of circulation and readership. The newsmagazine sells circa 1.5 million print and digital copies every week, similar figures to the most widely-read newspaper in the UK, *The Sun,* albeit *The Sun* is published daily rather than weekly, and a considerable portion of *The Economist*'s readership is based outside of the UK (Ponsford June 13th 2014).

The Economist is therefore suitable as a test case for non-institutional support of neoliberalism due to its ideological pretensions and its influence. However, *The Economist*'s suitability for this research also arises from its content. The publication has always been committed to covering non-UK issues. It has for a long period of its history dedicated a considerable part of each issue to foreign affairs, and it permanently stations correspondents in various geographical areas around the globe, including Latin America. As such, *The Economist* has a history of covering issues that are not just non-UK but are in fact non-Global North. Such a history and continuity of this coverage provides an ample body of material from

which this research can draw. *The Economist* can therefore provide a window into pro-capitalist coverage and analysis of issues in Chile as they were unfolding, and on a consistent basis, whereas other such publications (such as daily newspapers, for example) may have been more inclined to focus much more heavily on domestic affairs. Furthermore, *The Economist* has since its inception stuck to the tradition of ensuring a uniform voice throughout its pages, which is established and maintained by the anonymity of its writers (Wroe 2018). This gives the publication the impression of having a sole contributor and thus a sole voice, and this allows this research to track any change in its coverage of Chile (or, perhaps, lack thereof) and to associate that with the overarching editorial line of the publication rather than to attribute it to changes in personnel. *The Economist* is therefore selected as a suitable test case for right-wing non-institutional support of the neoliberal project on the basis of its ideological foundations, its influence and its content.

viii. Concluding remarks

This chapter has established the various components of the case studies that are analysed and used to answer the research questions elucidated in the previous chapter. The opening three sections of this chapter justify the rationale for looking at neoliberalism in Chile. Section ii provides a picture of Allende's presidency as one not of radical socialism but as one of a Presidency committed to post-war consensus capitalism. This provides a contrast against which the neoliberal turn, undertaken by the military junta, can be compared. Section iii reviewed existing historiography of the coup, highlighting a small yet burgeoning body of work that has interpreted the coup as the founding moment of neoliberal hegemony. It is from this group of work that this thesis takes its justification for focussing on Chile as the "ground-zero" moment of the neoliberal project. Section iv provides a review of the Pinochet regime, justifying the 17-year dictatorship as the world's first truly neoliberal regime. This section also details the time frames under analysis and justifies their selection according to key events during and after the dictatorship. To add further weight to the justification for these date ranges, section v turns to a brief summary of the UK's political and economic history over the time frame of 1970 to 1999. This section draws out comparisons between the histories of Chile and the UK and highlights key events and processes over this period. Section vi then covers the specific groups under analysis in this thesis and their associated publications, justifying their selection according to the importance and influence they have had in British left-wing anti-capitalist politics. Section vii then provides a similar justification for the right-wing test case that has been selected to act as a contrast against left-wing discourse – *The Economist*.

As such, the various components of the case studies can now be brought together. The period under analysis in this research is 1970 to 1999. In order to make the analysis more manageable and more structured, this period is broken down into six date ranges which have been selected for their dual importance to Chilean and British political history. These are as follows: 1970-71, 1973-74, 1979-80, 1984-85, 1990-91 and 1998-99. The publications under analysis have been selected due to their importance (or rather, the importance of their associated groups, where appropriate) to British left-wing politics over the period of analysis. These are as follows: *he Morning Star,* and *Marxism Today* (CPGB); *Socialist Worker* and *International Socialism* (IS/SWP); *Militant* (Militant Tendency); *The Black Dwarf/Red Mole/Red Weekly/Socialist Challenge/Socialist Action* and *Intercontinental Press* (IMG); *New*

Left Review (no affiliation); and *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* (RCG). In order to provide a contrast and comparison with right-wing pro-capitalist discourse, *The Economist* has been selected due it its ideological pretensions, its influence and its content. The material shall be drawn from each of these publications along the date ranges mentioned above. Having constructed the case studies, the following chapter can now explain in detail the design and methodology of this research and demonstrate how a Žižekian-Lacanian-Marxist critique of capitalism can be operationalised.

3. Research design and methodology

i. Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to constructing an appropriate research design, strategy and methodology for this project. The chapter begins with an exploration of the concept of neoliberal fantasy, teasing out the particular insights that Lacanian-inspired approaches to neoliberalism can offer. These insights serve as the theoretical focal points around which the analysis is built. Section iii then initiates the process of constructing the design and strategy of the research, beginning with addressing key ontological and epistemological questions. What then follows is a discussion of the anti-positivist framework within which this analysis takes place (section iv), a discussion of the decision to select an appropriate anti-positivist, qualitative research design (section v) and a discussion of various discourse analysis methodologies that appear to lend themselves to a study of this nature (section vi). The penultimate section, section vii, then broaches the methods of source selection and the particulars of how the analysis is undertaken. This section returns to the theoretical focal points elucidated section ii, exploring how best to operationalise them in order to make it possible to study them within the source material. The chapter concludes with some summarising remarks in section viii.

ii. Uncovering the neoliberal fantasy

In the first chapter it was established that this research takes its impetus in part from Žižek's ideology critique which rests heavily upon his own understanding of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Žižek postulates that ideology is the fantasy that covers up the unknowable content of the Real and that structures and gives content and meaning to the social world, known as the Symbolic in Lacanian terms. This research project takes this understanding of ideology and applies it to neoliberal capitalism, suturing together what appear to be competing perspectives on neoliberalism (neoliberalism as a form of governance, as a jurisprudential project or as an economic programme – also discussed in chapter one) to provide an understanding of neoliberalism as an ideological edifice that has both material effects and effects on subjectivity. In order to test for this, and therefore in order to craft a suitable research design and methodology, it is necessary to uncover the operational function of the neoliberal ideological fantasy. In order to do this, this thesis turns to scholars who have already broached this issue (partly at least). This means that this project takes an understanding of Lacanian theory from existing literature, rather than crafting its own take on Lacan's body of work. This is a purposeful decision, one taken to avoid this thesis descending into one that explores Lacan's work in inexhaustible depth, which is outside of this project's remit. The project is instead dedicated to exploring how neoliberalism was established as the hegemonic structure in the West following the Chilean coup of 1973 and was further entrenched throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Hence the decision to engage and use material that has already drawn upon Lacan to (re)conceptualise contemporary capitalism.

A cornerstone of this research is *Critical Theory and the Crisis of Contemporary Capitalism*, by Heiko Feldner and Fabio Vighi (2015). The insights of this piece lend themselves to this study firstly because the authors are co-directors of the University of Cardiff's 'Žižek Centre for

Ideology Critique', meaning their work and expertise rests upon Žižek's Lacanian-inspired theory of ideology. The book in question develops Žižek's theory into a robust understanding of the operation of capitalist ideology in the post-2007/8 financial crisis. Feldner and Vighi use Lacan's 'Four Discourses' extensively in their examination of post-crisis capitalism. These discourses are the discourse of the Master, the University, the Hysteric and the Analyst, which were developed in Lacan's *Seminar XVII* (Lacan 2008). The Master is the discourse that embodies the struggle for mastery and domination. The University embodies scientific rationality and stakes a claim as to holding a universal truth. The Hysteric embodies direct resistance to the Master and, finally, the Analyst embodies deliberate subversion of the Master (Lacan 2008; Olivier 2009; Feldner & Vighi 2015). The authors also extrapolate and offer a fifth discourse – the discourse of the Capitalist – which they believe to be the fundamental ruse of contemporary capitalist ideology. Feldner and Vighi note how modern-day capitalism has incorporated the discourse of the University in order to bolster its mastery, presenting the (neoliberal) capitalist economic form as an objective truth:

> 'Master, University and Capitalist are strictly interrelated discourses whose primary purpose is to capture a shift in the social link of modernity whereby mastery is not eliminated but rendered more efficient' (Feldner and Vighi 2015: 75)

What is inferred, therefore, is that the institutions and actors that constitute and maintain neoliberalism justify their position through the discourse of the University. The governments of neoliberalism act not as an all-powerful Master, but as executors of scientific truths. The discourse of the Master is displaced by the discourse of the University at the governmental-institutional level.

The question then arrives as to what becomes of the Master. Feldner and Vighi contend that the discourse of the Master is transposed onto the subject themselves, through the process of capitalist consumption:

> 'The capitalist worker/consumer qua agent is constantly deluded into believing that "he can get what he wants" (if only he pays for it); or, which amounts to the same thing, that *he knows how to satisfy his desire*. The fact that this never works out is, of course, the ruse upon which capitalism is based: against our illusion of constant gratification' (Feldner and Vighi 2015: 82; authors' own italics).

The subject perceives themselves to be in total control, imbued with an erroneous sense of autonomous, individualised mastery. What emerges from the work of Feldner and Vighi are themes that permeate the literature that was explored in the first chapter. This idea that the subject within the neoliberal paradigm is imbued with a sense of individualised power chimes with the critical political economy literature that understands neoliberalism as an economic system that individualises people while simultaneously stripping institutions of power. The same notion can be detected in the literature that interprets neoliberalism through a governmentality framework. The notion that neoliberalism is articulated as a scientific truth also chimes well with the jurisprudence literature, whereby the effects of neoliberalism are detected in legal systems that uphold neoliberal capitalism as an inescapable truth.

One other area of Žižekian theory that provides a foundational element to this research's design and methodology is his debate with Ernesto Laclau. Emerging in the early to mid-2000s, Žižek and Laclau entered into a theoretical dispute around the concept of particularization, which stems from the two theorists' differing perspectives on ideology. Laclau, along with his co-author Chantal Mouffe, developed a theory of hegemony, building off the work of Gramsci (Laclau & Mouffe 2001). Laclau viewed all ideological structures as the representation of a particular as the universal, and that the impossibility of universality is actualised in an external obstacle (something to be overcome) (Laclau 2006b). This is what Laclau understood to be hegemony. Laclau rejected the idea of universality as really existing, meaning that all political struggles, even Leftist ones, must take the form of the struggle for the establishment of their particular as the universal (*ibid.*) Thus, all political struggles are struggles for hegemony. This means that Laclau rejected the class determinism of orthodox Marxism that views the 'proletariat' as the agent of the universal cause of communism. Žižek rejects this notion, and instead accuses Laclau of accepting neoliberal[8] ideology himself. Žižek posits that the ultimate ideological fantasy of neoliberal capitalism is the acknowledgement of the impossibility of universality beyond distorted representations of a particular (Žižek 2006c). By promoting struggles for the establishment of a particular as the universal without articulating them through the prism of the 'universal equivalent of all struggles' (*ibid.*: 554) – anti-capitalism – Leftists inadvertently agree to the ideological ruse that the impossibility must be presented and articulated as a surmountable external obstacle (Butler et al 2000). Žižek uses this to not only denounce Laclau, but to denounce and explain why Leftist struggles today have moved from the wide-reaching global goal of overthrowing capitalism in favour of identity struggles for acceptance (such as the feminist struggle for equal pay, or the gay rights struggle for equal marriage) (*ibid.*). Žižek's reasoning is that particular struggles within capitalism are externalized from the overarching cause (capitalism itself). Particular issues are then rendered simple obstacles to the capitalist utopia, problems that can be overcome by simple policy remedies (such as equal marriage to solve homophobia, or more provisions for recycling to solve the climate crisis. As McMillan states, 'the negation of the universal horizon by the symptom, which represents the exception of the universal, is therefore not considered a condition of the market, but rather something external to be fixed; a solution-in-coming' (2008: 12). This debate also features in this study's research strategy. Given that Žižek's ideology critique is at this study's core, this notion that part of the neoliberal ruse is to fragment struggle into seemingly unconnected particulars is also used in the analysis of the source material.

This research, thus, begins with Žižek's ideology-critique, utilises the insights of Feldner and Vighi who have similarly built upon Žižek's work, and mediates their insights through existing literatures on neoliberalism that were reviewed in the first chapter. Section **viii** of this chapter discusses how these tropes – the individualisation of the subject, the depoliticisation of state institutions and the particularisation of struggle – are operationalised in this study's analysis, exploring how said tropes of neoliberal fantasy are to be detected in the source analysis. First, however, it is necessary to construct an appropriate methodology and research design, beginning first with a discussion of fundamental ontological and epistemological considerations.

[8] The Žižek-Laclau debate was not couched around the term 'neoliberalism', but instead 'capitalism'. However, given the debate occurred in the mid-2000s, it is taken as read by this research that the theorists understood capitalism in its most recent permutation, identified by this research as neoliberalism.

iii. Ontological and Epistemological Considerations

It is first important to examine the current state of political science research with regards to the concept of ideology before going on to review ontological and epistemological position of this research and its design. Presently, a gap has emerged between political theorists and political analysts in this field. Shapiro contends that 'political theorists have become altogether too narcissistic…Increasingly they see themselves as engaged in a specialised activity distinct from the rest of political science' (Shapiro 2002: 596). On the other hand, political scientists – those who research and study political actuality – have remained dedicated to 'a fully-fledged scientific study of politics and society' (Glynos & Howarth 2007: 1). The reflections of Shapiro and Glynos and Howarth are more general – the authors are expressing reflections on the whole field of political science and analysis in general terms. These reflections, however, certainly apply to research in the field of ideology. One of the primary concerns raised in the first chapter regarding the works of Slavoj Žižek, for example, is that his works are rarely applied to concrete political experiences. He prefers to concern himself with popular culture, drawing metaphors from milieus such as Hollywood cinema. Researchers who have attempted to apply the Lacanian theoretical model to specific cases have fallen into a similar trap. Salecl's *The Spoils of Freedom: Psychoanalysis and Feminism After the Fall of Socialism* (1994) suffers from a similar methodological deficit in so far as the author does not use specific evidence to justify her Lacanian analysis of feminism in the formerly communist eastern bloc. Despite being insightful into the Lacanian reading of capitalism, Feldner & Vighi's *Critical Theory and the Crisis of Contemporary Capitalism* (2015) also follows Salecl insofar as the authors do not use specific forms of evidence to justify their interpretations.

At the other end of the spectrum are the "scientists" whose work on ideology treats ideology as an objective fact and as some sort of pre-determined variable that is easily definable and whose effects are easily quantifiable. Ahmed's study of ideological controversies involved in nation-building in Pakistan does just that. The author defines ideology as 'generalised formulations about a Good Society' (Ahmed 1991: 26) and proceeds to use that definition to examine points of contention within the nation-building project in Pakistan. Many do not even define ideology in their studies, instead preferring to imply or assume a meaning of the term, thus relying on the reader to assume the same interpretation of ideology. Parsa (2004) and Džihana and Volčič (2011) imply ideology as a certain understanding or sense of national identity in their studies, while Robinson and Sandford (1983) assume a rather descriptive and normative understanding of ideology when taking into account factors that affect UK government officials' decision making when it comes to constructing tax policy. What these authors share is an approach that Shapiro describes as 'method driven' (Shapiro 2002: 596) whereby a formulaic approach to ideology is adopted with no real consideration of either the actors' (who are being studied) nor the researchers' (who are doing the studying) ontological or epistemological positions.

There are, however, positives to both approaches to the study of ideology. While the theorists may not ground their insights or perspectives in (much) political evidence, their conclusions are generally held at the "macro" level. One of the benefits theorists like Žižek bring to the table is that their conclusions can be applied across the political world. These conclusions are

very much "general" conclusions. On the other hand, while the 'method driven' scientists may not reflect much on theory (which has particularly problematic implications re ontology and epistemology), their research – and the conclusions derived from that research – is very much evidence-based. This gives their research a strong empirical grounding. This research project bridges this divide, drawing each approach's strengths while acknowledging, and at the same time attempting to avoid, their weaknesses.

Having just acknowledged the ontological and epistemological deficiencies of the 'methods driven' approach to political study, it is now right to purposefully consider this research's own such position. One's epistemological position – the perspective taken by a researcher on knowledge and what can be known – inherently rests on that same researcher's ontological considerations. Attending to the ontological question is important for 'an ontological enquiry…focuses attention on the underlying presuppositions for any analysis of politics' (Glynos & Howarth 2007: 108). In order to determine this ontological position, it is appropriate to return to the theoretical framework within which this project's subjects of enquiry are conceived. The subjects of this inquiry are Marxist political newspapers and theoretical journals, and these are being used to explore the implantation and solidification of neoliberal ideology in the West, through an understanding of ideology inspired by Žižek. The subjects of this inquiry are concurrently conceived within a Lacanian ontology, which is an ontology of lack, a negative ontology. Stavrakakis expertly describes this Lacanian negative ontology:

> 'The founding moment of subjectivity, the moment when linguistic/social subjects come into being, has to be associated with symbolic castration, with the prohibition of incest that disrupts the imaginary relation between mother and child and permits our functional insertion into the social world of language…It is the command prohibition and our subjection to it that institutes our social world' (Stavrakakis 2007: 174)

A negative ontological position leads to a certain understanding of power structures and political relations between subjects and power. Considering this project examines the relationships between subjects and power in the frame of a particular critique of ideology (à la Lacan via Žižek), it is important to now reflect on what this ontology of lack means for the understanding of these relations. Assuming a negative ontology means power is not fixed or inherent, meaning it is contingent upon structuring discourse. This discourse is not fixed, rather it is open ended and always susceptible to change. Thus, an assumption made by this research is that all social beings enter into the social world and are bound in it by structuring yet fluid and incomplete discourse. Lacan himself acknowledged this and developed his own version of structural linguistics, building off the work of Ferdinand de Saussure (Radzinski 1985). The incomplete signification of structuring discourses indicates a gap between the subject and the Lacanian Real. This delivers a distinctly Lacanian epistemology. As not everything can be signified, nothing within the social world (that being the world created by man, as opposed to the natural world) can be held as inherently true, for there is nothing certain or concrete (no evidence from the Real) that guarantees that trueness. Knowledge, therefore, 'is never adequate: something always escapes' (*ibid.*: 8). Lacan acknowledged this: 'I always speak the truth…Not the whole truth, because there's no way, to say it all…Saying it all is literally impossible' (Lacan 1990: 13-14).

This research adopts this negative ontology (and latterly, epistemology) which is adopted retrospectively having accepted the Žižekian-Lacanian critique of ideology. This research therefore stands in opposition to the aforementioned “methods-driven", “scientist" approach to political study. This form of study can be labelled “positivist”, for the authors accept an inherent trueness in their research approach. Their descriptive, often implied understanding of ideology – the phenomenon the aforementioned authors were studying – belies this positivism, for no ontological or epistemological consideration is made. Thus, the approach adopted by this research can be labelled “anti-positivist". The next section explores what the positivist and anti-positivist approaches mean for the researcher and this research’s own position is reflected upon. This reflection, which necessarily leads on from this research’s ontological and epistemological position, has ramifications for the way in which this study is conducted.

iv. Knowledge production within an anti-positivist framework

The positivist approach to political and social research was principally developed within the French academy in the 18th and 19th centuries. One of positivism’s most profound originators was Émile Durkheim (Emirbayer 2003). Durkheim developed a sociological method in which he viewed behaviours and actions of subjects as observable ‘social facts’ (Durkheim 2007: 141). For Durkheim, social facts are ‘a clearly determined group of phenomena separable, because of their distinct characteristics, from those that form the subject matter of other sciences of nature’ (Durkheim 2007: 141). Durkheim’s position that certain social phenomena can be extrapolated as ‘facts’ has had a lasting impression in political science, and this positivism can be felt throughout the discipline. In the aforementioned examples of studies on ideology (Robinson & Sandford 1983; Ahmed 1991; Parsa 2004; Džihana & Volčič 2011) this positivism is certainly present, whereby each of the authors treat ideology as an observable ‘social fact’, as a phenomenon separable from subjectivity itself.

This approach, however, is troubling, particularly with regards to its implementation in a study of ideology, not least a Lacanian-inspired analysis of ideology. Positivism assumes that all that is observable is all there is, meaning that Lacanian theory and its stress on fantasy make it an uneasy bedfellow with a positivist approach. The positivist approach to political study also has implications for the way in which study is undertaken by the political researcher. In a positivist paradigm,

> ‘“Facts” exist independently of the observer and his or her values; and the goal…is thus to build an objective empirical foundation for knowledge which will produce testable and verifiable statements to explain, predict and attribute causality to events and processes in the world’ (Burnham et al. 2004: 23).

As such, in the examples mentioned in section (iii) there is understandably no reflection by the authors on their own positions as researchers. The knowledge they produce from their studies is accepted as having that inherent trueness. The authors, by implication, conceive themselves as acting objectively and independently from the subjects and phenomenon (ideology) they study. However, this study takes a Lacanian-inspired approach which means

that not only is there a wholly unobservable, fantasmatic logic to ideology that escapes the definition of 'social fact' (proffered by Durkheim), but the researcher involved in this Lacanian analysis of ideology is also unable to escape the ideological discourses within which they themselves are located. Therefore, the positivist approach is also rejected from this perspective and an alternative must be sought out which incorporates the position of this research within the research design.

Breaking with the legacy of Durkheim, Pierre Bourdieu offers some perspectives that are particularly insightful for this research project. In *The Craft of Sociology,* Bourdieu writes:

> 'For the sociologist, familiarity with his social universe is the epistemological obstacle *par excellence,* because it continuously produces fictitious conceptions or systematisation and, at the same time, the conditions of their credibility…The separation between perception and science, which is expressed for the physicist in the opposition between the laboratory and daily life, is even harder for the sociologist to make, because his theoretical heritage does not provide him with the tools that would make it possible to radically challenge ordinary language and everyday notions' (Bourdieu et al 1991: 13; authors' own italics)

As Bourdieu expertly acknowledges, the researcher of social phenomena is much less a scientist than the positivist tradition perceives. The researcher is acutely involved in the phenomena they are studying and certain elements of that cannot be escaped or avoided. Linking back to the theoretical foundation of this project, this means this research cannot maintain a position whereby this thesis is somehow "outside" of neoliberal ideology, for this study is undertaken within a 21st century capitalist country (the United Kingdom). This inevitably has implications for the methods of analysis. Positivist approaches place emphasis on 'observation as the sole means of verification' (Burnham et al 2004: 24). No such emphasis can be placed on observation in an anti-positivist research strategy. Not to say, of course, that observation cannot play a role whatsoever; rather, observation as the sole analytic method will not suffice in this project considering the research problem's theoretical foundation and this research's own ontological and epistemological considerations. In the next section various types of analytical tools and methods are explored and the research strategy is constructed, taking into consideration the research problem and the ontological and epistemological standpoints of this thesis.

v. Research strategies: quantitative versus qualitative study; subsumption versus articulation

The first decision that has to be made vis-à-vis research design is quantitative versus qualitative study. Quantitative study – the study of empirically measured variables such as electoral results, surveys and so on – is inexorably linked to positivist ontology. The empirical approach, otherwise known as the 'scientific method' (Buttolph Johnson & Reynolds 2005: 27) or 'empiricism' (Burnham et al 2004: 23-24) rests on the previously discussed facets of positivism. Firstly, the position of the researcher is assumed to be objective and fundamentally external to the subject of research, meaning the knowledge generated from the quantitative study is perceived to be inherently true. Secondly, there is an assumption that the social phenomena being studied are themselves fundamentally true, or in

Durkheim's terminology, 'social facts' which are wholly observable. Naturally, considering this research's negative ontology and epistemology and the Lacanian-inspired theoretical framework employed by this project, a quantitative study of ideology is deemed unsuitable as a research strategy.

This means that a qualitative research design is selected. However, as quantitative studies are inherently positivist, that does not mean qualitative studies are inherently anti-positivist. Returning to the studies of ideology mentioned section iii, none of these studies were quantitative, insofar as they were not empirical studies which used descriptive statistical analysis as their analytical tool. Yet the conclusion was reached that they were nonetheless positivist studies. This means that care and consideration is needed when strategising this research's methodology so as to avoid picking or constructing any method simply because it is qualitative. It is important to reflect on this point. Positivist, qualitative studies fall into the trap of subsumption. Glynos and Howarth explain:

> 'From the point of view of naturalism[9], a particular empirical instance is ideally explained when it is *subsumed* by a universal causal law, law-like statement or causal mechanism. In this conception of explanation, individual variations between cases are secondary to the law or mechanism, the latter remaining intact as they are 'applied' to explain successive cases' (Glynos & Howarth 2007: 166; authors' own italics).

This quotation points to the issue of "methods-driven" studies. These qualitative studies apply their method or theory to phenomena and then "subsume" the phenomena under the method, making the evidence fit and justify the method's selection. So how best to overcome this issue? If quantitative study is unsuitable because the theoretical framework demands that the research problem (ideology) is not an observable social fact, and qualitative study is still problematic as the dangers of subsumption and method driven analyses indicate, then what is the appropriate method for this project?

This thesis uses Glynos and Howarth's 2007 book *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Theory* as the centrepiece of its research design. The authors reject quantitative strategies along similar lines to their rejection proffered by this research project and turn to qualitative design. Yet, rather than relying on subsumption as a mechanism for explanation, the authors instead offer up an alternative approach – articulation. Articulation is the process by which the subject of study is approached and understood through an interpretative analysis that is acutely informed by theoretical perspectives:

> 'Social science explanation involves the articulation of different theoretical concepts together in a concrete empirical context, in an effort to provide a singular critical explanation of a problematised phenomenon' (*ibid.*: 180)

This issue of providing 'a singular critical explanation' is key here when adopting a qualitative, anti-positivist approach to critical analysis. The problem with strategies grounded in positivism is that subsumption will inevitably lead to the constitution of unanticipated results as expected anomalies. At the other end of the spectrum, however, is an approach that is too

[9] By 'naturalism' here the authors are referring to ontological positivism. The correctness or incorrectness of a social science explanation is 'naturally' determined by the underlying supposition of an inherent trueness.

concerned with the particular that draws out no general conclusion from the study. This type of strategy means that the analysis places 'no methodological constraints on the production and assessment of putative explanations and critical evaluations' (*ibid.*: 7). In other words, everything is fair game. This why "ownership" of interpretation by the researcher is of upmost importance when adopting a qualitative strategy, and furthermore, it is even more important when that qualitative strategy is founded upon an anti-positivist perspective. Burnham, Gilland et al. call this process 'making inferences' (Burnham et al 2004: 143). This is a process whereby the researcher seeks to take the results from their analysis and apply them to a broader set of cases rather than just the specific ones used to reach those results. In this process, the researcher must be acutely aware of the theoretical foundations upon which their research is predicated and use those theories to interpret the date – in other words, "own" the data. The theory becomes a supremely important analytical device because 'theories of politics enable researchers to arrange abstract concepts in some relationship to one another' (Burnham et al 2004: 144).

As such, this study strives to adopt a middle ground, accepting at the same time a need to avoid positivism and embrace the theoretical insights Lacanian psychoanalysis has on ontology and epistemology (set out above), but at the same time striving to reach conclusions that can teach us general lessons rather than just particular ones. In order to do this, this study adopts a discourse analysis that is informed by Lacanian psychoanalysis. Glynos and Howarth construct three 'logics' of political science that aid their interpretation and analysis of problematics. The first is the social logic 'which enable us to characterise practices in a particular social domain, say the practices of consumption and exchange within an economy, or an entire regime of practices' (Glynos & Howarth 2007: 133). The second is the political logic which provides 'the means to explore how social practices are instituted, contested, and defended' (*ibid.*: 133). The final logic is the fantasmatic logic, which is 'closely linked to the ideological dimension' (*ibid.*: 134) of social relations. In other words, the fantasmatic logic helps us understand how subjects 'are rendered complicit in concealing or covering over the radical contingency of social relations' (*ibid.*: 134). The overarching premise of a 'logic' is that it 'comprises the rules or grammar of the practice as well as the conditions which make the practice both possible and vulnerable' (*ibid.*: 136). Logics are not concrete laws that determine universally how or why a practice is constituted, rather they provide a lens through which one can better understand its constitution.

Glynos and Howarth argue that 'a social science explanation involves the mobilisation of [all] three types of logic' (*ibid.*: 133), however the subject(s) of inquiry necessarily determine(s) which logic(s) are given more focus when it comes to analysis. The topic of this study is the manner in which a new ideological regime (neoliberalism) was constituted and maintained in the aftermath of the Chilean 1973 coup. As such, this study predominantly focusses on mobilising the political and fantasmatic logics in order to critically analyse and explain this phenomenon. The fantasmatic logic, given the choice of Glynos and Howarth's word 'fantasy', is necessarily Lacanian in its theoretical underpinning. This is important to note because analytical strategies that are strictly based in discourse theory alone are, as Stavrakakis points out, 'unable to account rigorously for the resistances to social and radical transformation' (Stavrakakis 2007: 20-21) and are 'not sufficient in order to reach a rigorous understanding of the drive behind identification acts and to explain why certain identifications (old or new) prove to be more forceful and alluring than others' (*ibid.*: 166). As Alcorn states, this strand

of post-structuralism has 'over-simplified our understanding of signification' (Alcorn 2002: 106). This is why using the insight of Glynos & Howarth's Lacanian-inspired notion of the fantasmatic logic is crucial in this particular study. A purely discursive analysis would be unable to attribute why and in what ways the neoliberal ideology was able to take hold and why the Left was unable to offer a coherent counter-narrative. In Stavrakakis' own words, it would be unable to elucidate 'what sticks' (Stavrakakis 2007: 163). Instead, 'a Lacan-inspired approach is more adequately equipped to address this crucial problem: when things stick it is because, apart from offering a hegemonic symbolic crystallisation, they effectively manipulate an affective, libidinal dimension' (*ibid.*: 20-21). In other words, a Lacanian-inspired approach allows the researcher to go beyond traditional discursive approaches by enabling the researcher to conceive of the 'libidinal dimension' of social relations – the dimension that plays that fantasmatic role of concealing the gap of the Real, and that thus constitutes and makes sense of the Symbolic.

vi. Methods of analysis: the minefield of discourse analyses

This discussion has thus far taken place at a purely theoretical level, attempting to draw a distinction between this research's own Lacanian-inspired anti-positivist-qualitative research strategy and other positivist-quantitative and qualitative strategies. However, what does this strategy actually look like? What forms or methods of analysis, what analytical tools shall be used to achieve this strategy? It is important to reaffirm at this point that a discursive approach is adopted in this research, given the importance of discourse that Lacan places at the heart of his (negative) ontology. There are three prominent forms of discursive analysis that have been developed over the last few years by academics which appear to lend themselves to this project. This is by no means an extensive or exhaustive list of discursive analytical methods, rather it is a small selection of methods that, in the first instance, appear to offer the best approaches for this project. These are Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Rhetorical Political Analysis (RPA) and Political Discourse Theory (PDT). Before choosing which method to choose, it is worth reminding what exactly my project is seeking to uncover. Earlier in this chapter theoretical foundation of the research problem was explored in further depth (section iii), building further upon the first chapter. What results is the focus of this project: a study into the construction of the discourse of the Capitalist (à la Lacan via Feldner and Vighi) that supports present day neoliberal capitalism. What is therefore being researched is the fantasmatic logic (to use Glynos and Howarth's terminology) that lies behind neoliberal ideology, and how that logic operated (and continues to operate) at the institution and solidification of neoliberalism in the West. Considering this, it is important to choose a discursive analytical method that can account for and help understand the mobilisation of fantasy within neoliberal ideology's discursive structures. For this reason, PDT is selected as the best method for analysing the sources analysed in this research (which were discussed in the previous chapter). Before exploring PDT, it is first important to discuss the other two options available – CDA and RPA – and explain why they are not suitable alternatives.

CDA, developed by, amongst others, Norman Fairclough, tries to distance itself from other discursive approaches by studying specific cases with 'global explanatory goals' (Fairclough 1995: 43). As Fairclough explains, 'for critical discourse analysis…the question of how discourse cumulatively contributes to the reproduction of macro structures is at the heart of the explanatory endeavour' (Fairclough 1995*:* 43). In this manner, CDA allows the analyst to

view particular cases with the ultimate goal of drawing out conclusions that may provide general insights into wider phenomena. This is a particular strength of CDA and is something that is particularly useful for this project, which indeed is looking to use particular case studies to explicate macro-level conclusions. However, CDA remains very focussed on texts themselves, looking at the direct relationship between textuality and power structures:

> 'CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting backwards and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistic, semiotic and literary analysis, and the macroanalysis of social formations, institutions and power relations that these texts index and construct' (Luke 2002: 100).

CDA rests much of its method upon 'classic discourse analysis techniques' (Breeze 2011: 501), which, as Widdowson claims, makes CDA 'not the systematic application of a theoretical model, but a rather less rigorous operation, in effect a kind of ad hoc bricolage which takes from theory whatever concept comes usefully to hand' (Widdowson 1998: 136). Further to this methodological deficit, CDA's fascination with the textual analysis and texts themselves makes it an ill-fitting choice for a study founded upon Lacanian theory. The methodology for this project needs to allow a look at the construction of the ideological fantasy within the text while simultaneously being able to look *beyond* it. While CDA's attempts to look at the relation between text and structure are undoubtedly welcome, its obsession with the content of the text itself is troubling. In essence, what this project requires is a method that can see or detect that which is not contained within the text yet nevertheless structures and informs it.

RPA is a newer variant of discourse analysis, formulated by British theorist Alan Finlayson. As indicated by its name, 'RPA consists in its rehabilitation of rhetoric as a legitimate focal point of political analysis' (Glynos et al 2009: 13). RPA's great strength is that it seeks to involve the context in which a speech or text is produced into the analysis of that very speech or text. What RPA is thus advocating is looking at the overall argument in which a text is located, as well as the actual contents of that text. This look at the argument allows the researcher to go further and articulate what makes that argument more or less appealing than others. However, similar to CDA, RPA is nonetheless very much concerned with textual analysis (more often than not, RPA is applied to speech rather than physical texts – see Finlayson (2004; 2007; 2008)). The task of locating the type and context of the argument being put forward in a text (speech or physical) rests upon two main criteria: emphasis (the way in which certain textual elements are emphasised/de-emphasised), and the researcher's own interpretation. The latter criteria mean RPA suffers from an ontological deficit as practitioners of RPA position themselves exterior to the texts they are analysing and the subjects that produced them. Returning to the ontological and epistemological considerations of this project, RPA comes into conflict with the perspectives of this thesis.

Overall, the problems identified with CDA and RPA stem from this thesis' adoption of a Lacanian-derived ideology critique (à la Žižek). What is detected within these two approaches is the temptation of the researcher to impose an interpretation of the text, and thus an interpretation of the individual(s) involved in producing that text. This is a problem of which Lacan was very much aware. As Parker writes,

> ‘[Lacan viewed] this kind of imposed interpretation…as exemplifying the “discourse of the master”…In the discourse of the master, the analyst assumes the position of master signifier in relation to the other signifiers, and that relationship…serves to cover over the fallibility of the analyst’ (Parker 2005: 177)

Parker continues:

> ‘The position of the analyst as a kind of master can be masked in the name of knowledge. A form of discourse analysis that aims to “educate" readers, rather than to illuminate a text and open up questions about it, would be represented in Lacanian terms as operating within “the discourse of the university”’ (*ibid*.: 177)

As such, the ‘reflexive’ position of the researcher is paramount when undertaking a Lacanian-inspired study and, thus, is paramount when devising and choosing a method of analysis (Parker 2005: 173). It is for this reason this thesis arrives at PDT, which lends itself more readily to this project than the others. That is not to say that PDT is a prescriptive analytical mode that can simply be “cut and pasted” onto this project. Nonetheless, many of its characteristics are insightful for this study, more so than the aforementioned CDA and RPA. Firstly, PDT places at its heart ontological considerations of the role of discourse. In PDT, ‘natural, physical and cultural objects are thus understood and acquire meaning in discourses…they are “discursively constructed”’ (Glynos et al 2009: 8). This perspective chimes well with the Lacanian understanding of structural linguistics, resonating with Lacanian ideas such as master-signifiers. Furthermore, proponents of PDT ‘assume that all systems of meaning are, in a fundamental sense, lacking’ (*ibid.*: 8). Within PDT and Lacanian discourse theory, therefore, there is a shared negative ontology. Furthermore, PDT allows for a reflexive analytical position. Unlike other approaches, which prescribe certain methods of analysing text, PDT offers no such prescription. Instead, PDT stresses articulation, whereby the researcher brings together empirical elements (e.g. quotes from, or whole, texts) and theoretical elements. Further to this, PDT also advocates a ‘deconstructive method’ (Howarth 1998: 287), which is borrowed from Jacques Derrida: ‘Derrida’s technique of deconstruction is a practice of reading which takes the written metaphysical text (broadly construed) as its object’ (*ibid.*: 287). The researcher then applies a ‘“double reading” [which] aims at rigorously reconstructing a text while showing its “limits”; identifying the impossible “points of closure” in a text which both allow the text to function but, simultaneously, undermine it’ (*ibid.*: 287). This process of deconstruction overcomes the ontological deficit of other interpretative approaches (like CDA and RPA). Deconstruction necessarily ‘includes a substantive and critical outlook informed by the view that metaphysical texts are constituted around the privileging of certain conceptual oppositions and logics…and the repression of others’ (*ibid*.: 287). Of course, PDT is not an infallible method of analysis. As Howarth admits, there potentially exists an ‘application problem’ (*ibid.*: 288). PDT, unlike approaches such as CDA and RPA, which have clearly defined and well-established analytical tools at their disposal, relies heavily upon theoretical perspectives informing analysis. This is why this thesis uses Glynos and Howarth’s conceptualisation of ‘logics’ and invokes their term ‘articulation’ when it comes to analysis (Glynos and Howarth 2007). This approach provides the best possible method of achieving the “middle ground” between over-theorisation of study and subsumption. Given this, the following section describes the methodology of the source analysis and how this is informed by the research design.

vii. Source analysis

Having established the research design and strategy of this project, the methodology of the source analysis can now be explained. In the previous chapter it was discussed how the source analysis is structured around date ranges between the overarching range of 1970-1999. These date ranges have been selected due to their importance to the histories of Chile and the United Kingdom and their experiences of the neoliberal turn, and are as follows:

ii. 1970-1971
iii. 1973-1974
iv. 1979-1980
v. 1984-1985
vi. 1990-1991
vii. 1998-1999

With regards to source selection, all articles published between the 1st of January of the opening year of the date range and the 31st of December of the closing year of the date range are eligible for consideration. The material is narrowed down by only selecting articles in which Chile is mentioned. These may be articles dedicated specifically to Chile or articles in which Chile is mentioned as part of a broader topic. This process is made more manageable by some publications which are archived electronically. This applies to *Marxism Today* (CPGB), *New Left Review*, *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!*, as well as *The Economist.* These online archives allow for keyword searches within documents. Relevant articles are found by searching for keywords associated with the themes and topics of this research, including the following: 'Chile', 'Allende', 'Pinochet', 'Coup', 'Neoliberalism', 'Popular Unity', 'Chicago Boys'. Other publications under analysis are either archived in physical locations or are archived online but do not have the ability for keyword searches. This makes the source selection process more time consuming, as all articles published in these publications within the above date ranges are read in their entirety in order to discover which articles are relevant for this research. A full list of the archives consulted in this research is provided at the end of this thesis.

Having set out the selection process of the source material, it is important now to reaffirm some theoretical elements and to operationalise these elements in this study. It has already been established that Žižek's Lacanian-inspired ideology critique is useful due to the emphasis it places on fantasy in the process of the construction and institution of belief systems and power structures, or, in other words, how fantasy constitutes our social world. This fantasy may appear in the first instance difficult to operationalise because, simply put, how can one test for something that is unseen? However, in returning to Feldner and Vighi's (2015) extrapolation Lacan's Four Discourses and their analysis of capitalist ideology, there are ways in which one can detect the construction of the ideological illusion. Feldner and Vighi discussed how modern capitalism expertly manipulates the discourses of the Master and University to ensure its domination. What has emerged over these first chapters is that neoliberalism fundamentally rests upon processes of individualisation of the subject and depoliticisation of both state institutions and the economy. In texts, these tropes are perfectly observable, for it is discourse that structures our social world and this discourse is open to

change (meaning is never foreclosed). In the analysis of the source material in this research, a search within the sources for discursive elements (types of words used, sentence construction, tone and so on) which demonstrate this manipulation of discourses is placed at its forefront. Therefore, in each article studied in this thesis, the analysis centres around the deconstruction of the text by highlighting phraseology that demonstrates the author's articulation and understanding of key themes. These themes are informed by the existing literature on neoliberalism that is reviewed in chapter one: economics, governance and jurisprudence. The narratives in the texts that deal with each of these issues is analysed with the invocation of Lacan's Four Discourses as understood and developed by Feldner and Vighi (2015). This follows the methodology of articulation, set out in vi of this chapter, whereby the text is deconstructed and interpreted through the lens of the theoretical underpinning of this study (that being a Lacanian-inspired critical theory of ideology). Any changes in narrative around these three themes are tracked by arranging the analysis over a historical trajectory, starting with the analysis of the material of the early 1970s and ending with the material of the late 1990s. Many articles are analysed in this study, but not all are discussed in the analysis chapters. This is purely due to the limitation of space. The articles that are discussed in the following chapters are selected to provide a snapshot of an overarching trend that is perceptible throughout all articles analysed. Any articles that contradict or otherwise buck any predominant trends are highlighted and specifically discussed. This ensures that this study stands up to academic rigour and scrutiny and avoids potential accusations of cherrypicking.

The findings of this research are divided into four analysis chapters, which constitute the second half of this thesis. Each chapter follows a linear timeline, beginning in the 1970s and ending in the late 1990s, so as to track any and all discursive and narrative changes in the texts and to link them to key moments in the histories of both Chile and the United Kingdom. The first (chapter four) is dedicated to *The Economist*. The material drawn from *The Economist* is subjected to the same rigorous analysis to which the left-wing material is subjected. This means that the right-wing test case is given its own standalone chapter, from which general conclusions can be drawn about the nature of right-wing, pro-neoliberal discourse over the 1970-1999 timeframe. Conclusions made and trends uncovered are then able to be compared and contrasted with the findings of the analysis of the left-wing material. The remaining three analysis chapters are not dedicated according to publication title, rather they are divided according to the three main established approaches to understanding neoliberalism. This means there is one chapter dedicated to governance and governmentality (chapter five), one chapter dedicated to jurisprudence (chapter six) and one chapter dedicated to economics (chapter seven). Each chapter highlights the nature of left-wing coverage of Chile's experience and how that coverage relates to each of these three themes. This means that how the Left understood and articulated its understandings of the state (chapter five), the law (chapter six) and the economy (chapter seven) can be isolated and explored in depth. This also means that any commonalities and differences between the narratives around these three themes can be exposed. Furthermore, separating the analysis into three chapters in this manner allows for an examination of to what extent each theme is discussed in isolation from one another. This operationalises the Žižek-Laclau debate, exploring whether under neoliberalism the Left particularised different political struggles, each one articulated as independent from the other. The chapters are then brought together in a final concluding chapter (chapter eight)

which will condense this thesis' conclusions and establish further lines of academic inquiry in this area that are opened up by this research project.

viii. Concluding remarks

This chapter sets out the research design, strategy and methodology of this research project. It opens with a brief examination of key theoretical themes that are involved in a Žižekian-Lacanian analysis of neoliberal capitalism (section ii). What emerges is the utility of Lacan's four discourses and, in particular, the discourses of the Master and the University, in such a study. Turning to the work of Feldner and Vighi (2015), this study engages with the notion that neoliberalism's operation rests upon the ability to manipulate these discourses, transposing the discourse of the Master onto the subject while sustaining and justifying itself with the discourse of the University, thus positioning itself as an irrefutable natural law. This chimes well with the existing literature on neoliberalism that is explored in chapter one, and thus an understanding of neoliberalism as a depoliticising and individualising force emerges. What also emerges is the notion of neoliberalism as a particularising force. Delving into the Žižek-Laclau debate of the 2000s, it is uncovered that part of Žižek's understanding of neoliberalism is that it is an ideological project that in part functions by isolating and particularising individual political struggles, disconnecting them from what he sees as the global emancipatory anti-capitalist struggle. This is also included as a theoretical focal point around which this thesis' analysis is based.

Ontological and epistemological considerations are addressed in section iii, in which this study's negative ontological and epistemological position is established, and then serves as the foundation for the selection of an anti-positivist strategy (section iv). These considerations then play a key role in the selection of an appropriate discourse analysis methodology, which is premised upon the method of articulation as set out by Glynos and Howarth (2007) (section v). Having explored multiple discourse analysis methodologies, this thesis opts for PDT as it lends itself most readily to the entire premise and theoretical underpinnings of this research (section vi). This chapter concludes with an outline of the methodology of source analysis, drawing together the particular methods of source selection with the research design and strategy set out previously. This chapter has demonstrated that the possibility of crafting a research methodology from a Lacanian-founded critical theoretical perspective. As this has not yet been done in the existing academic literature, this chapter contributes to the fledgling Lacano-Marxist "school" in this capacity. The following chapters demonstrate not just the possibility, but the plausibility of utilising this methodology in political analysis, starting with a chapter dedicated to the right-wing test case selected for this study, *The Economist*.

4. *The Economist*: the changing narratives of the Right and the entrenchment of neoliberal ideology

i. Introduction

This chapter marks the beginning of this project's analysis of the source material described in chapter 2. This section begins with an analysis of the discourse of the Right. The influential classical liberal-oriented newsmagazine *The Economist* has here been selected to provide a case study from which an understanding can be drawn of not only how neoliberal ideology functions, but also of how those obversely and purposefully embodying and advancing neoliberal ideology deployed it. It is important to stress at this juncture that this thesis' goal is not to provide a historiographical narrative of how publications that support or oppose capitalist ideals came to embrace neoliberalism. Rather, this thesis' goal is to develop an understanding of how neoliberal ideology functions, and an understanding of how it has been so successful at entrenching itself as the dominant global worldview. Thus, rather than analysing multiple Right publications which may have varying political sympathies and editorial lines, *The Economist* has here been selected to provide a snapshot of how capitalist discourse has changed and this is concretised in the publication's evolving coverage of Chilean politics between 1970 and 1999, as is explored in this chapter.

This chapter, as with the following chapters, has been structured according to time. As with all sources analysed in this thesis, articles from *The Economist* are selected from the following date ranges: 1st January 1970-31st December 1971; 1st January 1973-31st December 1974; 1st January 1979-31st December 1980; 1st January 1984-31st December 1985; 1st January 1989-31st December 1990; and 1st January 1998-31st December 1999. This is to provide a more focused scope for analysis and the justification for these date ranges is set out in the previous chapter. The structure of this chapter therefore follows these date ranges, beginning with the subsequent section (ii) which concerns the 1970-71 material and ending with the penultimate section (vii) – the final section (viii) being the conclusion – which deals with the 1998-99 material. This structure allows for a transparent, easy to follow discussion and explanation of how neoliberal ideology has come to profoundly shape and inform right-wing political discourse over time. In line with the methodology and strategy set out in chapter three, the following analysis focusses around how neoliberal ideology has shaped conceptualisations of state governance, jurisprudence and economic matters.

ii. 1970-1971: pre-neoliberal capitalist discourse at the height of social democracy; the 1970 Chilean election

The Economist has long had a very diverse and global reporting brief, being able to station correspondents permanently outside of the UK in regions in both the global north and global south. As a result, its coverage of Chilean politics has been relatively consistent and lengthy, even as far back as the early 1970s. During the period of 1970 to 1971, the coverage naturally focusses on the 1970 election, the campaigns, the outcome and the first year of the Allende government. *The Economist* consistently took a very hardline oppositional stance to Salvador Allende and his electoral campaign. Writing on September 5th 1970, one day after the election, *The Economist*'s correspondent stated that 'there is the very real possibility of violence provoked by the clandestine ultra-leftist groups which have declared war on the

whole constitutional process' (September 5th 1970: 33-34). The title of this article, 'Chile: The ends against the middle', encapsulates the narrative pushed by *The Economist* during this period: that Allende may lead Chile down a much more radical path away from the centre ground. This concern is repeated in the months following the September election in articles such as 'Chile: Leftward Ho!' (November 7th 1970) and 'The Santiago Vigil', in which the author claims that 'the men at the centre are being squeezed out of politics' (November 21st 1970: 14).

These early articles do not tell us much about the functioning of pre-neoliberal capitalist ideology, other than the fact that its spokesmen were happy to push an overtly biased editorial line in their publications. As the Allende administration pressed on with its campaign pledges – to continue land reform started by the previous Christian Democrat government and initiate nationalisations of heavy industry, amongst others – the oppositional stance taken by *The Economist* hardened, claiming that the leftist government posed the single greatest threat to Chilean liberal democracy. An article published in December of 1970 titled, 'Down the Kerensky Road', warned of Allende's supposedly totalitarian ambitions: 'If a real congressional crisis came about, Dr Allende could dissolve parliament instantly and stage a plebiscite. Past experience suggests that ruthless presidents do not lose plebiscites' (December 26th 1970: 14). The author continues with their concerns:

> 'The thing to watch for in the new year is how Dr Allende goes about tightening his grip over the machinery of government. The new government monopoly of newsprint gives him an easy tool for taming the press… With a socialist ensconced in the ministry of the interior, Dr Allende is well placed to turn the police into a political force. State control of the banks will enable him to cut off one traditional source of election funds for the opposition parties' (*ibid.*: 14)

It is in 1971, however, that some key insights into pre-neoliberal capitalist ideology can be drawn from *The Economist*'s coverage. In 1971 the nationalisation of the copper industry gets under way and the reporting of this takes on an interesting characteristic. *The Economist* asserts in the October 9th 1971 issue that,

> 'the Americans have got reason to be worried about the way that Chile's President Salvador Allende has moved in on the foreign copper interests in his country… He has always promised to compensate the three American companies affected…But the government has taken its time deciding just what the book value of the investments amounts to, and in the meantime, Dr Allende has presented the companies with a hefty bill of some $7770 million for "excess profits" and another bill for repairs to plant and equipment…A major confrontation is almost certain to come about in the course of the next few weeks' (October 9th 1971: 44)

What this demonstrates is that *The Economist* here is quite happy to play up the political implications of a largely economic decision. As is explored later in this chapter, when the Pinochet regime is installed following the coup, and the economic counter-revolution begins, the economic is strictly delineated from the political by *The Economist* as it strives to support the economic and social change enacted by the junta.

iii. 1973: the discourse of pre-neoliberal capitalist ideology shines through; the run up to the 9/11 coup

The melding of the political and the economic in *The Economist*'s continual criticism of the Allende administration that is highlighted above strengthens vociferously and acts as the focal point in the articles published prior to and after the coup of September 11th 1973. In the week following the parliamentary elections in March, *The Economist* wrote that,

> 'this election was a plebiscite: a chance for Chileans to pass judgment on a government that has allowed inflation to rise to its current rate of 259 per cent a year, turned Santiago into a dismal city of queues and empty shops, and subjected a substantial part of the population to political interference with their daily lives through the communist-run committees that distribute food' (March 10th 1973: 19)

In the same article the correspondent presses for the Allende government to find a 'solution for the economic and social problems it has created in its headlong rush to transform a pluralistic society into a marxist one' (*ibid.*: 19).

This interrelationship between the economic and the political, specifically the accusation that the political decisions of the government have had drastic economic consequences, can be well interpreted through a Lacanian lens. In chapter three Lacan's four discourses were discussed. Lacan elucidated that the Master is the discourse of obverse power and control (Lacan 2008; Feldner & Vighi 2015). The articles discussed thus far evidence that *The Economist* ascribed the Master's discourse to the state, interpreting the state as a body that possesses a mastery and power to transform various aspects of the social world, including the economy. *The Economist* is holding up the Chilean state, under the governance of Allende and his coalition, as the all-powerful body in Chilean society, as the body that has the ability to make political decisions that carry major economic consequences (wholly negative ones in its view).

This analysis is reinforced following the coup of 11th September 1973 as *The Economist* went to great lengths to deny external involvement (namely American) in it and to stress that the coup was the direct result of government policy. In the first piece penned after the coup, titled 'The End of Allende', *The Economist* pulls no punches in condemning Allende and openly welcoming the coup as a supposed route to a return to liberalism:

> '[The] coup was home-grown, and attempts to make out that the Americas were involved are absurd to those who know how wary they have been in the recent dealings with Chile. The military-technocratic government that is apparently emerging will try to knit together the social fabric that the Allende government tore apart. It will mean the temporary death of democracy in Chile, and that is to be deplored. But it must not be forgotten who made it inevitable' (September 15th 1973: 17)

Up until the coup *The Economist* is steadfast in its positioning of Allende's government as the Lacanian Master (the article cited immediately above opens with the line, 'the blame [for the coup] lies clearly with Dr Allende' (*ibid.*: 16)). However, the image of the state as the all-powerful Master quickly begins to change in *The Economist*'s analysis. It was discussed at

length in chapter three that the ruse of neoliberal lies in its ability to replace the discourse of the Master with the discourse of University – the discourse of objectivity and rationality; an anti-political discourse. One of the most surprising things thrown up by the source analysis has been that this transference of discourses occurred on the Right even before the policies often associated with neoliberalism (monetarism, free market trade policies, privatisation, and so on) had been implemented. This leads to a preliminary conclusion that the predominance of neoliberal ideology experienced today did not occur as a result of Friedmanite economic programmes but served as a foundation for their implementation. This is seen with the immediate change in the form of analysis of Chile proffered by *The Economist*, which is discussed at length in the remainder of this chapter.

iv. 1973-74: the immediate change in capitalist ideology; the changing conceptualisations of the state by the Right in the wake of the coup

The conceptualisation of the role of the state by the Right changed instantaneously following the coup. An article published merely eleven days after the coup evidences the transference of the discourse of the state from Master to University. *The Economist* immediately imbues the Chilean armed forces, the instigators of the coup and the incoming protagonists in the post-Allende state, with the University discourse. Posing the question of who are the leaders of the military junta, *The Economist* responds, 'the answer is that most of the new ministers (only two are civilians) are professional soldiers who clung to the idea that the armed forces should keep out of politics' (September 22nd 1973: 17). The author continues this line of analysis by asserting that the armed forces are to reluctantly 'shoulder the burden of sorting out the economic crisis' (*ibid.*: 17). Immediately, the new government is positioned as an objective, anti-political body whose role is to manage Chile – primarily her economy. Indeed, even in the preceding article ('The End of Allende'), there are hints that this new form of governance would be given a managerial image, as indicated by the use of the term 'military-technocratic' (see above). The allusions to "technocracy" – a system of government based on decision-makers' knowledge and expertise (Burris 1993) – is telling of how the Right, captured here in the snapshot of *The Economist*'s coverage, wished to conceptualise the new regime.

This detached, dispassionate and anti-political regime is encumbered by *The Economist* its first priority: resolving the economic crisis. In the discussion of the economy, *The Economist* promptly delineates and separates economic issues from political ones. It is discussed in chapter one how existing critical political economy (CPE) literature understands neoliberalism as promoting economics as an irrefutable science, elevating it to an academic study akin to the natural sciences or mathematics. This is also a task swiftly undertaken by *The Economist*:

> 'The problem that is probably fundamental, however, is that of rebuilding the economy. There is an urgent need to set realistic prices for the products of state-run industries to cut down the enormous budgetary deficit that is fuelling inflation. General Pinochet emphasises that the payrolls of these industries must be cut down in order to promote efficiency, but that this will produce a tremendous unemployment problem unless alternative jobs are found. That, in turn, will depend on pumping life back into the private sector' (September 29th 1973: 46)

The economic problem is now discussed in terms of an absolute necessity, and the solutions to that problem are portrayed as if they are medical remedies. Note also the centrality of importance given to inflation in the extract, indicating a monetarist conceptualisation of economics. The whole discussion is grounded in a tone of "common sense" (note the use of the term "realistic prices"). *The Economist* is not suggesting policies that may align with a certain political and socio-economic doctrine, it is prescribing an economic treatment like a doctor would prescribe a medicine to treat an illness. Thus, what is being evidenced in the immediate wake of the coup is not just a transference of discourse around the state from Master to University, but also the same transference of discourse around economics. Above it is discussed how the Allende regime was blamed for the economic ails suffered by Chile. The economic problem was a direct result of political decisions. Now, the economy is being discussed as something almost entirely remote, a spectre almost completely removed from politics. Here it is clear that the tropes of depoliticisation uncovered by CPE literature overlap significantly with understanding neoliberalism as an ideology that manipulates discourses.

It would, however, be disingenuous to state that politics and economics are categorically separated from one another once the coup has occurred. This does eventually happen, with politics and economics given their own separate articles, most notably in the 1980s, and this is examined later in this chapter. However, at least in the immediate period following the coup, *The Economist* does maintain the faintest of links between economics and politics, and this is also telling of the workings of the new neoliberal capitalist ideology. It has already been discussed how *The Economist* portrayed the coup as a necessary act, an act required to protect Chile's liberal democratic traditions in the long term. This somewhat echoes Naomi Klein's dissection of neoliberalism, where she asserts that neoliberal economics rests on applying a short, sharp bout of 'shock treatment' to secure a brighter economic future (Klein 2007). It appears that to *The Economist*'s eyes this is also what is required for the political realm: the short, sharp bout of 'shock treatment' (realised in the violence of the coup and suspension of democratic freedoms) is required to prevent Chile from slipping away from liberal democracy in the long term. As was published on September 15th 1973, 'the work of reconstruction will involve considerable sacrifice' (September 15th 1973: 16). *The Economist* also asserts that while this sacrifice will be both economic (austerity) and political (suspension of democracy), it is the economic sacrifices that will deliver political redemption. Turning its guns on British voices of opposition to the coup, *The Economist* makes the case that a more classical-liberal economic programme and a general "opening up" of the Chilean economy to the world marketplace is the only way to return Chile to liberal democracy:

> 'It is worth bearing in mind that the kind of blockade Mrs Hart [Judith Hart, Minister of Overseas Development during the Callaghan Labour government and an opponent to the Pinochet regime] wants would, if anything, make the generals feel more isolated, and therefore perhaps even more illiberal' (March 16th 1974: 40).

The Economist continued with this line of reasoning as opinion within the Labour government appeared at the time to start to sway towards severing economic ties with Chile:

> 'Isolation and economic blockade have tended, in the past, to produce a kind of siege mentality that has made illiberal regimes still more illiberal in their ways, and has hurt a lot of ordinary people in the process' (April 20th 1974: 15)

This particular confluence between the economic and the political – that only a specific economic doctrine of free markets can deliver liberal democracy – remains the only one the Right appears willing to countenance, as seen in the snapshots above of *The Economist*'s coverage. Other than that, the indefatigable drive to separate the economic from the political was unrelenting and it is not just the terms in which the economy is discussed that are noteworthy. The way in which discussions of the Chilean economy are published also require attention. For the remainder of 1973 and the entirety of 1974, *The Economist* went to such great lengths to delineate the economic from the political that it began publishing economic discussions and political discussions in entirely separate articles (other than the two cited above). Political discussions are given their own dedicated articles such as 'Chile: The Fighting's Not Over Yet' (September 22nd 1973), 'Chile: Pepe Captured' (October 6th 1973), 'Chile: But China Stays' (October 27th 1973), 'Chile: Bad Enough but Not That Bad' (December 22nd 1973), 'Fingers in the Chile Pie' (September 14th 1974) and 'The Pinochet Way' (September 14th 1974)[10]. Economic issues are then discussed separately, in articles such as 'Chile: Bone for the Left' (March 16th 1974) and 'Morals in the Marketplace' (April 20th 1974)[11]. This is a more subtle attempt to separate the two spheres from one another, positioning politics and economics as two entirely different topics of conversation. This stands in marked opposition to the coverage of Allende by *The Economist*. As highlighted earlier in this chapter, the Allende government was charged with having total control over both the economy and political institutions. In Lacanian terms, the Allende government embodied the discourse of the Master. Now, it seems that the coup has served as an act to strip away this mastery from the state, and its mastery over the economy, and in its place the University discourse now occupies the state, particularly around its management of economic matters. Linking to the CPE literature, the neoliberal drive to depoliticise both the economy and state institutions rests upon a clever manipulation of discourse, as well as policy.

v. 1979-80: the embedding of neoliberal ideology and its expansion on home shores; Thatcher's first electoral victory

The next time frame for analysis is between 1979 and 1980. As is elucidated in chapter two, in 1979 Margaret Thatcher is elected Prime Minister of the United Kingdom for the first time, and it is Thatcher's premiership that is widely considered to be the driving force behind the neoliberal counter-revolution in the UK (Cafruny & Ryner 2003; Arestis & Sawyer 2005; Harvey 2007). Arranging source analysis around key moments in Thatcher's time as Prime Minister allows for an identification of key moments in the solidification of neoliberalism as the dominant ideology of the time. It was previously described how following the 1973 coup *The Economist* markedly changed key parameters of its coverage and analysis of Chilean politics. The state went from being the all-powerful force within Chilean politics and economics to being an anti-political managerialist collective that, crucially, had little political input into economic administration. Thus, what has been evidenced so far is a reconceptualisation of both the state and the state's relationship to the economy by a key

[10] 'Chile: The Fighting's Not Over Yet', 'Chile: Pepe Captured' and 'Chile: But China Stays' concern armed left-wing resistance to the junta. 'Chile: Bad Enough but Not That Bad' and 'The Pinochet Way' concern alleged human rights abuses carried out by the junta. 'Fingers in the Chile Pie' concerns American involvement in the coup

[11] 'Chile: Bone for the Left' and 'Morals in the Marketplace' concern the British Labour politicians voicing their support for breaking economic ties with Chile in the wake of the coup.

protagonist of the Right. This not follows Feldner and Vighi's (2015) Lacanian deconstruction of neoliberal ideology as a shift of discourses from Master to University, but also follows the understanding of neoliberalism offered up by critical political economists. In the 1979 to 1980 period, this shift is solidified by *The Economist*.

The major development in Chile during this time period was the ratification of a new constitution that was drawn up by the Pinochet regime. This was approved by a national plebiscite on September 11th, 1980, an irregular process due to its lack of an electoral roll, meaning fraud was easy to perpetrate (Nohlen 2005). The new constitution provided greater powers to the President of Chile (General Pinochet) and did not allow for legal recognition of Marxist political parties, meaning only social democratic, liberal and conservative groups were considered legitimate in the eyes of the law. It also afforded Pinochet an uncontested eight-year term as President (Muñoz 2008). Given this significant event, *The Economist* during this period naturally focused its reporting on the constitution, the plebiscite and the aftermath of its ratification. What is striking about its coverage is its relative lack of analysis and lack of tangible evidence of a strong editorial line. In other words, *The Economist* took a rather anti-political stance (on the surface at least), focusing on reporting a narrative or account of events. The articles published during this time make strong statements that are, more or less, accurate, such as, 'it's [the constitution] aim, above all, at preventing a resurgence of Marxism' (July 19th 1980: 40) and, 'the constitution also aims to institutionalise the country's new free-market economic policies…so that no future socialist government will be able to overturn them' (September 6th 1980: 33). Yet there is no discussion, no analysis of these points. *The Economist* does not entertain questions such as, "why is the junta de-legitimising Marxist groups?", or, "why does the junta want to codify free market economics into the country's system of governance?". While this reporting appears to be objective in its simple recounting of events, it does betray how imbued *The Economist* has become with neoliberal ideology. The commentary is conspicuous by its absence. What is seen here is a robust continuation of the discursive transference explored above. *The Economist* has gone to such lengths as to de-politicise the new Chilean state and its economic agenda that it has attempted to de-politicise its own reportage. It has legitimised both the junta and its economic programme by presenting them as irrefutable facts of Chilean politics rather than as constituent parts of a capitalist counter-revolution.

What this evidences, furthermore, is legal institutions, such as a constitution, being re-conceptualised as irrefutable facts also. Returning to the jurisprudence literature covered in chapter one, the neoliberal project is understood as having a jurisprudential element that positions legal structures and the actors that interact with and constitute them as being objective entities observing laws as if they were naturally occurring. To use Kelsen's theory of the *grundnorm*, the constitution is being positioned as a basic norm, one which is to be universally observed and obeyed without question. The constitution's neoliberal foundation clearly evidences a new constitutionalist approach. Gill's insights on new constitutionalism are worth repeating here: 'to allow dominant economic forces to be increasingly insulated from democratic rule and accountability' (1998: 23). There is thus a confluence between the Lacanian understanding of the discourse of the University – now being ascribed to Chile's legal transformation by *The Economist* – and the jurisprudential "new constitutionalist" understanding of neoliberalism. Chile's new constitution is stripped of its political capacity by pro-neoliberal actors (in this case, *The Economist*) so as to provide a quasi-scientific

justification to the Pinochet regime's neoliberal counter-revolution. The question that arises is then why is *The Economist* doing this? Why not resolutely congratulate and endorse the new constitution? The answer to this again lies in Lacanian theory. It has already been established that state institutions are no longer being conceptualised as embodying the discourse of the Master. What also emerges, however, is that supporting voices, such as publications like *The Economist*, no longer embody this mastery either. Instead they, like the state, embody the University discourse of objectivity and science. This is no better seen than in the special supplement *The Economist* published on the 2nd of February 1980 titled 'Chile's Counter-revolution: a Survey', a 27 page magazine dedicated to exploring Chile's new political regime[12].

Typical of the new rules *The Economist* has seemingly imposed upon itself, issues of politics (namely the accusations of human rights abuses perpetrated by the junta) and issues of economics (the free market neoliberal economic experiment undertaken by the junta) are presented as two separate issues. Articles covering the former occupy the first half of the document, the latter occupying the second half. In the opening half of the document the articles focus on the now undeniable abuses of state power and use of violence by the junta. These articles take an apologist tone. They downplay the repression while simultaneously forging a context in which to justify it: 'since the coup, Chile's record on human rights has been one of the worst in South America. But not the worst' (Harvey February 2nd 1980: 6); 'in trampling on Chilean democracy, the soldiers were acting for more understandable motives than those in Peru or Bolivia, who seized power simply because they had an itch to rule' (*ibid.*: 6); 'Behind the scowl of a twentieth-century big brother lies a centuries-old Latin phenomenon: an army *caudillo* of middling brutality' (*ibid.*: 6); 'any democratic pressure in Chile was answered by repression. Not on the bloodthirsty, Hitlerian scale depicted by some outsiders. But repression of the bad, old-fashioned, Latin American military kind' (*ibid.*: 10). These are just some examples of how *The Economist* is attempting to strip responsibility from the state's actions. The repression is portrayed not as a result of an American-led western encouragement to crush working class politics, but as something that just happens in Latin America, an unavoidable fact of the continent's political landscape. Again, the state is stripped of its political capacity, of its mastery, indicative once more of the operation of neoliberal ideology.

The second half of the magazine, that which focusses on Chile's economy, is even more telling of the new ideology of capitalism, and it gives specific insights on how the Chilean subject is re-conceptualised within the neoliberal paradigm. The supposed economic miracle taking place in Chile at the time now provides the subject with a new role. The author is keen to repeatedly highlight the improving material wealth of the Chilean people: 'Chilean living standards have improved over the past couple of years' (*ibid*.: 13); 'suffering is a thing of the past' (*ibid.*: 25). The most cogent sign that consumption and material wealth is fundamental to this new ideology lies in a simple photograph on page 21 of the publication. In it two well-dressed young Chilean women are eating ice lollies, the tagline reads 'tasting the joys of an unshackled economy' (*ibid*.: 21). This is a clear and actual representation of what Žižek describes in his film *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology*: 'we are interpolated, that is to say

[12] This supplement is the only material source from *The Economist* studied in this research that lists an author. In this case, the author was Robert Harvey, who became assistant editor of the publication in 1981 and was elected to Parliament in 1983 as a Conservative MP, serving one term until 1987

addressed by social authority, not as subjects who should do their duty, sacrifice themselves, but subjects of pleasures' (Fiennes 2012). This picture and its accompanying tagline are the most ideological of tropes. As Feldner and Vighi contend, the ruse of neoliberalism is to transfer the discourse of the Master onto the subject itself. These young women are literally tasting their mastery. They are enacting this mastery through the process of consumer choice. This overlaps neatly with the governmentality approach to neoliberalism which interprets the neoliberal paradigm as having subjectivisation effects, insofar as the subject is re-articulated as an individual *homo-economicus* that simply makes decisions through economic cost-benefit analyses. This then constrains the subject by closing them off and isolating them from others. To repeat Bevir, discussed in chapter one, 'neoliberalism constructs and enforces an individualisation of responsibility' (2011: 465).

All the while, the articles that surround, precede and succeed this photograph, are laden with other tropes typical of neoliberalism. Chile's economy is again conceptualised as a patient in a hospital: 'Inflation, the habit the Chicago boys were trying to get their patient to kick, is down from 600% under Allende to some 30% last year' (Harvey February 2nd 1980: 17). Economics is treated like a science that obeys irrefutable natural laws: 'they [the Chicago Boys] look on economics as a pure science' (*ibid.*: 17); 'government spending was the principal cause of inflation in 1970-73 and…it starved the private sector of funds' (*ibid.*: 21); 'Because the world refused to help Chile, shock treatment…was probably the only way that success could have been achieved' (*ibid.*: 26)). Political redemption in the form of a resumption of liberal democracy is seen as a consequence only of economic liberalisation: 'the servants of a regime which had helped to take away Chile's political freedom have committed themselves to giving the country greater economic freedom' (*ibid.*: 17). The supplement is also interspersed with various adverts promoting investment opportunities in Chile aimed at British capitalists, a direct address to accumulate more wealth and to consume[13]. What this magazine supplement ultimately provides is the first insight into how the subject is re-conceptualised within neoliberalism. Once again, there is a confluence between Lacanian-inspired insights on the manipulation of discourse and other existing approaches to critiquing neoliberalism, namely, in this case, the governmentality insights on subjectivisation and individualisation.

vi. 1984-85: neoliberalism asserts itself; the miners' strike

Moving forward to the mid 1980s, a time in British politics defined by the seminal miners' strike that can be viewed as a direct representation of the confrontation between the new neoliberal right and the old socialist left (Paterson 2014), it is clear in *The Economist*'s continuing coverage of Chile that the new ideological practice of delineating the economic from the political remains a key determining factor in the way Chilean issues are covered. This is initially apparent in the way in which economic issues are discussed in wholly separate articles to political ones, mirroring the trend first established in the mid to late 1970s. 'Chile: Unwelcome Guests' (March 3rd 1984), 'Chile: Shy Terrorists' (June 9th 1984), 'Pinochet Won't

[13] Full list of adverts: Banco de Santiago (p. 2), Corfo (p. 3), ProChile – Chilean Export Bureau (p. 4), Compañía de Acero del Pacíficos (p. 7), Compañía Manufacturera de Papeles y Cartones (p. 9), Banco Unido de Fomento (p. 11), Banco de Chile (p. 12), Banco de Crédito e Inversiones (p. 15), Banco Osorno y la Unión (p. 16), Banco del Trabajo (p. 19), iansa-Chile (p. 20), Colocadora Nacional de Valores (p. 23), Banco de Chile (p. 23), Compañía de Acero del Pacíficos (p. 24), Banco Español-Chile (p. 27)

Go' (November 24th 1984), 'Chile: Getting Together at Last?' (March 30th, 1985) and 'Alternative to Pinochet' (September 14th 1985) all focus on acutely political issues facing Chile. Economic issues are discussed separately such as the article 'Chile, Peru and Bolivia: Feeling the Heat' (April 21st, 1984). As discussed earlier, this demarcation of economics and politics into separate articles reflects the attempt to de-politicise the economic, a fundamental aspect to neoliberal ideology. What is new during this time, however, is the much heavier focus by *The Economist* on politics. Economic issues are rarely discussed in the issues published during these years. Immediately this strikes as another ideological trope. By this time the junta has been in power for over a decade (1984 marks the 11th year of its rule) and Pinochet's seemingly unshakeable grip on the levers of power has now been further tightened by the enactment of his own constitution. The absence of detailed discussions of economics is telling insofar as it is an obvious implication of how the junta's economic agenda has now become a fact of Chilean socio-political life. There was little contestation to be had within Chile over the economic path the country is being taken down by the military regime because the regime has clamped down heavily on political dissent, particularly from the Marxist left, but it is striking how a news magazine that is not subject to the censorship controls of the regime also follows this route of not contesting the regime's economic agenda, as if there is an unspoken rule that one does not bring such concerns up for discussion. This is indicative of the power of the new ideological order, casting the economy out of the realm of politics and into the realm of natural science.

The content of the articles on Chilean politics also requires attention as the new preponderance for political discussion also betrays *The Economist*'s reportage as excessively obsequious. As is suggested by the titles of the articles, some of which are listed in the opening paragraph of this subsection, discussion focusses predominantly on the state of the legitimate[14] opposition in Chile. In the article titled 'Chile: Muddlers Don't Win', *The Economist* claims that, 'Chile now has a political slump as well as an economic one' (August 25th, 1984: 38). This opening sentence is not expanded upon, which immediately signals the continuation of trying to separate the economic from the political (the slump to which the author refers is the debt crisis sweeping Latin America at the time). Instead, this article is dedicated entirely to the supposed political slump. According to *The Economist*'s correspondent, despite Pinochet's control apparently weakening, 'he would not hand over power until he was convinced that there would be "no return to the past"' (*ibid*.: 39). In other words, Pinochet is refusing to countenance a return to liberal democracy when the legally recognised political parties remain in such a quarrelsome and fractious state. The state of affairs has led to a political stalemate:

> 'When Chile's opposition parties demonstrate violently against General Augusto Pinochet's intention to rule until 1989, he says their behaviour confirms how essential he is. The maddening logic leads to more violence' (September 15th, 1984: 51)

Chile's opposition must first obey the liberal democratic norms of constructive, peaceful debate, cooperation and compromise (both amongst themselves and with the regime) despite not existing in a liberal democratic society, before that liberal democracy is reinstated. In other words, Chile's opposition must show that it can be trusted to rule

[14] Legitimate is used here as identifying the opposition as those parties legally recognised by the government

peacefully and consensually in order for Chile to be delivered from the hands of a government that rules by violence and executive decree. The implication is that the opposition must abide by the neoliberal *grundnorm* set out in the 1980 constitution. The University discourse that pervades *The Economist's* conceptualisation of the legal framework of the country is clear. To borrow *The Economist*'s words, this is the maddening logic of neoliberal ideology. Earlier it was explored how in the immediate wake of the coup *The Economist* determined that the military regime and suspension of liberal democracy were essential to restore the economic integrity of Chile, and that this economic integrity was in itself essential to guaranteeing the Chile's future as a liberal democracy. It now appears that, in *The Economist*'s eyes, that point is close at hand. The 'economic slump' mentioned in 'Chile: Muddlers Don't Win' is scarcely discussed throughout the 1984-85 period, painting the picture that economic concerns are largely dealt with (for they are not up for discussion). It is Chile's political makeup that now requires attention.

What is more maddening is that *The Economist* appears to lay the blame for the regime's continuing control at the feet of the opposition and strips any culpability from the regime itself:

> 'Although it may be difficult for some Christian Democrats to face the fact, they might be more likely to return to power by negotiating skillful with the hated general than by challenging his police on the streets' (November 10th, 1984: 48)

This idea that it is the opposition that must take responsibility is reinforced in a lengthier feature article titled 'Pinochet Won't Go'; 'Unless Chile's politicians create a workable alternative' states the subheading (November 24th, 1984: 14). 'Consensus is still missing' laments the author (*ibid.*: 14), who calls for a return to what they clearly see as Chile's political heyday: 'Can Chile put together a workable alternative of the centre? Well, it did in 1964' (*ibid.*: 14). Two things to note here. Firstly, what is ultimately being sought from *The Economist* (which has unashamedly banged the junta's drum up to now) is a government that will continue the economic agenda of the junta without the violent oppression. The stress on the 'centre' reinforces the idea that the way forward under neoliberalism cannot entertain even a social democratic, let alone a Marxist, government. Secondly, putting the burden of responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the legally recognised opposition reinforces the depoliticisation of the Pinochet regime, a process initiated by the Right immediately after the coup. Following the coup in 1973, the incoming regime was portrayed as an apolitical collective of concerned military operatives, parachuted in to save Chile from its own politics. This was to be achieved by implementing a rigidly right-wing economic agenda. It is clear that in the mid-1980s this portrayal is still being employed.

By late 1985 it appears, according to *The Economist*'s coverage, that the opposition has done what was being called for: unity around a peaceful plan of gentle resistance to the regime. In 'Chile: A Real Opposition at Last' the Economist proclaims that,

> 'For years, Chile's politicians have been criticised for failing to form an alliance running from the right to the democratic left which could be a genuine alternative to the military government of General Pinochet, who seized power in 1973. The moderate opposition now appears to have done so' (September 7th, 1985: 55)

In the following week's edition, a larger article titled 'Alternative to Pinochet' was published. This article is one of the more eye-opening *The Economist* has written on Chile as it not only betrays its own editorial bias but betrays also the political agenda of neoliberalism. In it the author presents the only viable political system, not just for Chile, as a two-party system. What's more, these parties must be of the right or the centre:

> 'On the right, the four conservative parties should unite – preferably on a freer-market policy but unite anyway. That would give the generals, their wives and progressive businessmen more confidence to support a transition to democracy. The Christian Democrats can note optimistically that moderate parties of the centre and workable centre-left have been the usual winners in recent Latin American election [*sic*], but they (and the Socialists) should see there is now a clear definition of the unworkable left. Any Latin American government which frightens the IMF and the foreign bankers right away will impose intolerable misery on its people. If the Christian Democrats hold the balance of power, they should say they will make a coalition only with a party which works within the IMF's limits… General Pinochet and the army will not hand over power to party muddlers who might let the country slide into a new Allende era' (September 14th 1985: 16).

The author also makes the startlingly honest admission that the state of play is such that parties must submit to the global capitalist agenda, enforced by the IMF and other international financial institutions, less they wish to be subjected to economic warfare (note that this was never entertained as a possible factor in Allende's downfall).

Subjected to a Lacanian interpretation it is clear the articles continue the previously noted trends regarding the discourses of power and authority. The military regime is once again positioned as an apolitical regime that is merely enforcing policies that allow for good economic practice. The existing state structure is once more imbued with the discourse of the University rather than the Master, as is its treatment of the Chilean economy. Notably, the legal opposition is also being primed for this depoliticisation through discursive transference. While it may appear that parties such as the PDC are afforded a certain mastery by *The Economist* (they are portrayed as being the only ones capable of dislodging the junta), such opposition groups are also radically depoliticised insofar as they are only given the mantle of legitimate rulers-in-waiting so long as they accept the new economic structure and its constitutional underpinning. Thus, what is laid out here is the ideological trope that the state shall remain pervaded by the University discourse, regardless of whether its custodians are authoritarian (the junta) or liberal-democratic (the legal opposition). Furthermore, this anti-political conceptualisation of the state – as a guardian of the new economic truth – further advances this positioning of economics as an exact science, something established by existing CPE literatures on neoliberalism. The stripping of power from the state in this context also echoes some of the insights of governmentality approaches to neoliberalism. While the subject (the individual citizen) itself is not discussed in these articles, it is referred to indirectly through the depoliticisation narratives. Said narratives strip the state of culpability and responsibility, and transpose this onto the subject themselves, demanding of them a response that fulfils the state's needs (Vander Schee 2008). In this case, the need is for a democratic transition that does not threaten the new neoliberal orientation of the country. *The*

Economist suggests that this is only to be achieved if the individual protestors agitating for an end to the dictatorship behave accordingly. As is explored in the next section, the reinforcement of neoliberal ideological tropes such as these continue with a ceaseless fervour.

vii. 1990-91: closing in on victory; the coterminous ends of Pinochet, Thatcher and the Cold War

The 1990-1991 period was selected as a date range for analysis because it is identified roughly as the time when neoliberalism had "won", such that Western capitalism's primary foe – soviet communism – finally collapsed. It is also identified as such because when the statesmen recognised by this thesis as the political figureheads of the neoliberal counter-revolution (Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan and Augusto Pinochet) were replaced as heads of state, their successors did nothing other than continue their shared neoliberal legacy. Consequently, this period is accordingly assigned as the broad time frame when neoliberalism's entrenchment as the dominant global ideological order was confirmed as resolutely successful. *The Economist* published far fewer articles that covered Chile this time than previous time periods chosen for analysis. Even so, the few that are available offer up some interesting and noteworthy insights into neoliberalism as ideology. The articles cover some important landmarks in Chile's contemporary political history, such as the first democratic elections in the post-Pinochet era, the reburial of Salvador Allende's remains and the launching of the Truth and Reconciliation commission by President Patricio Aylwin, set up to investigate the human rights abuses of the military regime.

What is most apparent in this collection of articles is the continuing separation of economics from politics. 'The New Latin Beat' discusses the newly elected Aylwin and offers some reflections on Pinochet's rule:

> 'The Pinochet regime was oppressive and often cruel (though less so towards its end). But it left behind an admirably restructured economy, Latin America's best, newly directed to the outside world, with low inflation and a mass of brand-new jobs. Mr Aylwin, a Christian Democratic lawyer, is no radical. He and his friends lived through the populist spendthrift revolution that ended, 17 years ago, with the ruin of Chile and the death of its last elected president, Salvador Allende. They learnt the lesson of that tragedy, and of the subsequent years of military counter-revolution. Now they can acknowledge the good the grumpy Pinochet bequeathed them: an economy in which the spell of the two ancient evils of Latin American government – over-regulation and overspending – has been broken' (March 17th, 1990: 19)

This article does discuss the interrelationship between the political realm and the economic realms, something that has rarely occurred since the 1973 coup, but depoliticisation remains. The Allende years are portrayed as a laboratory, the increased government involvement in the economy as experimental. Pinochet's regime, by extension, then resumed normal service. The author also calls on the rest of Latin America to follow the same path of economic reform: 'Across populist Latin America, public spending and employment must be slashed, social services cut back. Mr Aylwin in Chile finds that unpopular but necessary work already done for him' (*ibid.*: 20). Note the use of the word 'necessary' here, again a reinforcement that

neoliberal economics is not a choice, it is a fact. The article is hagiographic of Pinochet's rule, lauding his economic reforms while concurrently seeking to minimise any discussion of human rights abuses. It also makes the contentious claim that state intervention in Latin America is somehow a legacy of colonial exploitation:

> 'General Pinochet also made a start on the longer-term reform that all Latin America needs. The poisonous legacy of its Iberian colonisation was a belief in economic and social management through detailed state regulation. This rewards the rulers' friends who masquerade as industrialists, while stifling the initiative of enterprising. It raises prices, suppresses growth and keeps the poor down. For all his autocratic bent, General Pinochet leaves behind a state less able to crush its citizens in this way' (*ibid.*: 20)

It is important to take stock of this claim. This excerpt is a less than subtle equation of neoliberalism and freedom. Neoliberalism is portrayed as equating the highest plain of liberty and this harks back to the special magazine supplement published by *The Economist* in 1980, which is discussed earlier in this chapter. In that discussion it is noted how *The Economist* went to great pains to demonstrate that the supposed economic miracle was allowing Chileans the opportunity exercise individual freedom through consumption. The new material wealth enjoyed by Chileans presented them the freedom choose their destiny within the neoliberal paradigm. This idea of personal liberty through economic liberty resurfaces once again here in the proposition that neoliberalism has finally unshackled the chains of colonialism that contained Latin America long after colonial rule ended. Again, this overlaps significantly with governmentality approaches that interpret neoliberalism as a subjugating force of commanded individuality, imbuing the subject with a sense of supreme responsibility to behave in a way that suits the state. This also serves to emphasise the point that neoliberalism is not a political-economic agenda, but a natural law that leads to liberation.

The view that Allende's administration was an epoch of experimentation, a deviation from the norm, is again revisited in an article published later in 1990. Concerning the reburial of Allende's remains, it is proclaimed in 'Chile: Allende's Ghost' that, 'the Allende experiment did Chile no good at all' (September 8th, 1990: 96). The article quickly turns into a commentary on the state of the Left in the West. It is proposed that, 'had he survived, Allende today would have become as reasonable a social democrat as Mr Rocard[15]' (*ibid.*: 96). It is also stated that,

> 'Allende's own Socialist Party, as a junior partner in Mr Aylwin's coalition government, is busy courting foreign investors, preaching labour moderation and recommending private investment in the remaining state companies' (*ibid.*: 96)

These statements are a reflection of the extent to which the Left has submitted to neoliberal ideology and moved towards the centre ground. Again, there is confirmation that both the state and economic policy have been stripped of their political capacity, of the discourse of the Master. The article is implying that even the once troublesome socialists have accepted the truth of free markets and the benedictions of private enterprise. Even the once radical Left has accepted neoliberalism, so much so that if Allende were alive today, he would also

[15] Michel Rocard, former Prime Minister of France and member of the *Parti Socialiste*

accept it as truth. This is something that is examined in depth in the remaining chapters of this thesis through the analysis of the British Left's reactions to, and engagement, with Chilean politics.

As previously highlighted, some of the political coverage concerns human rights abuses perpetrated by the military junta as one of the main issues of the day was the Aylwin administration's decision to officially review such allegations through the newly established Truth and Reconciliation commission. The form the coverage takes in dealing with such an issue – and other issues related to it – is striking for it is lacking much in the way of analysis. The articles are instead a narration of events. This is particularly evident in the article 'Chile: Solid State'. During this time small pockets of violence periodically erupted perpetrated by radical Leftist groups that both rejected Chile's new liberal democratic composition and the Truth and Reconciliation commission's limited scope (as they saw it). The correspondent notes that,

> 'With the advent of democracy, Chile's small left-wing paramilitary groups, formed to fight against the military dictatorship, were supposed to disband. Unfortunately, they have not… This past month has seen the assassinations of an army doctor and his wife, of a policeman, and of an elected right-wing senator, Jaime Guzman' (April 20th, 1991: 72)

The author refuses to go further, failing to explore the motivations for such attacks. It is most telling that there is no discussion of Guzman's past and why he was a prime target for such groups. Had such basic journalism been undertaken, Guzman's well-known prominent role in drafting Pinochet's 1980 constitution, which remains intact today and informed and structured the democratic transition in Chile, would have been highlighted. Instead he is simply described as an 'elected right-wing senator'. The article continues to dance around the root of these violent acts, instead bemoaning the actions of the groups: 'In their propaganda these terrorists scorn conventional politics and parties, including the traditional parties of the left' (*ibid.*: 72). What is seen here is another clear attempt at depoliticisation and the contiguous elevation of liberal democratic norms as the only acceptable expression of politics. The signifiers are Jaime Guzman's description ('elected right-wing senator'), the assignation of the perpetrators of the violence as 'terrorists', and the implication that Chile's newfound liberal democratic composition is 'conventional'. There is an alarmingly purposeful break from history here. Guzman is portrayed not as a key and divisive figure in Chile's recent political history, but as an innocent victim of unwarranted violence. The actors responsible (in Guzman's case it was the *Frente Patriótica Manuel Rodríguez* (FPMR – Manuel Rodríguez Patriotic Front)) are stripped of their political capacity and given a moniker that suggests irrationality. While many of the parties operating within Chile's new-found democracy may be 'conventional' (in the sense that they existed prior to 1973), its new political orientation is certainly not considering the constitution was drawn up by an autocratic military junta that took power through a bloody coup partly guided by foreign interests. All of this combines to further serve the purpose of promoting the new democratic state and its actors as the only acceptable configuration, as the new reality. In Lacanian terms, this form of coverage further serves to substitute the state's mastery with the University discourse. The state and its actors are presented not as one of many possible constellations of political structuring, but as the inherently and solely correct constellation. The counterposing of 'irrational terrorists' with

'conventional politics' also serves to further individualise the subject. The actions of the FPMR are derided and are stripped from any context, denying them meaningful content. To return to governmentality perspectives, the behaviour of these political subjects is cast in a negative light so as to place all responsibility on their soldiers, further subjugating them to the will of the state. As is explored in the penultimate section of this chapter, this drive to strip meaning from the junta's violent past continues relentlessly in the late 1990s when Pinochet is indicted for human rights violations by Spanish magistrate Baltasar Garzon on the 10th October 1998.

viii. 1998-99: neoliberal retrospection; looking back in the wake of Pinochet's indictment

By 1998, the year in which Pinochet is indicted and put under house arrest in the United Kingdom, *The Economist* has significantly changed its tune on Pinochet's human rights record. It has by this point now landed firmly on the side that views his abuse of power and use of violence as deplorable: 'Pinochet's personal record in matters of democracy and human rights is worse than patchy' (January 10th, 1998: 17). This new-found condemnation for the junta and its leader does not, however, signal a change in the neoliberal ideology that guides *The Economist*'s reportage and analysis. In the same article, titled 'Enough of Pinochet', the author states that, 'his economics was sound. The human-rights record of his regime was abominable' (*ibid.*: 17). According to the author, Pinochet's politics equals bad, Pinochet's economics equals good, and crucially there is no apparent relation between the two. It is of fundamental importance to reflect on this lack of interrelation between the politics of the junta (which is seen by *The Economist* as purely its authoritarianism and use of violence) and its economic agenda. It is discussed at length in chapter one how this thesis conceptualises neoliberalism as more than a set of economic policies. It is instead understood as a radical re-orientation of the social body towards the supremacy of the individual at the expense of the collective. This understanding builds on the perspectives of varying literatures. It is positioned that the violence of the coup was needed to force this radical re-configuration of the Chilean social body, that the violence begat a neoliberal society. This was even acknowledged by *The Economist* in the magazine supplement it published in 1980. On the possibility of a return to democracy, the author of the supplement stated that, 'a new generation must first be trained…to behave differently from its elders' (Harvey February 2nd 1980: 10). Fast forward to 1998 and this crucial link between violence and social reconstruction is removed. Instead, the issue of human rights is articulated as a closed signification, an issue that is entirely about state use of violence with no further addenda about why that violence was necessary in the ideological counterrevolution that took place in Chile. This echoes the argument made by Žižek in his debate with Laclau in the early-2000s (discussed in chapter three). Evident here is a removal of human rights abuses from the wider context in which they were perpetrated. The human rights issue is particularised, demonstrating another neoliberal trope: the particularisation of struggles. While Žižek's insights, and indeed the broader debate with Laclau, pertain largely to the state of the Left in the West, this notion of particularisation still holds water here. The way in which *The Economist* conceptualise and articulates the human rights issue belies the particularising element of neoliberal ideology, to remove context and thus diminish the struggle.

Once the indictment had been handed down in October 1998, *The Economist* began to warn of the possibility of putting Chile's democratic system at risk. In 'Chile: The Pinochet Backlash'

The Economist cautioned that 'social rifts are growing – and with them, in a few short days, the risk to Chile's hard-won international reputation as a moderate and calm, solid and stable, democratic country' (October 31st, 1998: 70). In 'Chile: Human Rights? What are They?', published a month later, it is claimed that,

> 'The right, still powerful in most law schools, has an evident interest in keeping the issue [of human rights abuses] under wraps. But so does the centre-left coalition in power in 1990. It fears upsetting Chile's transition to democracy. It wants to get on with more productive things – and to stay in one piece' (November 21st, 1998: 70)

What is evident here is a clear attempt by *The Economist* to keep the issue of human rights as a single, black and white issue that is sealed – to keep it particularised. The warning of a possible threat to Chilean democracy reflects a deeper concern about a possible contestation of the new neoliberal norm – a norm that was violently instigated and without popular consent – arising from within Chile. The drive to seal off the human rights issue is noticeable in articles published in late 1998 and throughout 1999. In November 1998 the House of Lords in the UK ruled that Pinochet could be extradited to Spain to face charges. Following the ruling, *The Economist* strives to articulate the issue as a purely legalistic one, one complicated and mired in legal processes. Articles such as 'Chile and Pinochet: Indignant, Up to a Point' (November 28th 1999), 'Britain: Not Much to Celebrate' (March 27th 1999) and 'Chile: After the Pinochet Ruling' (March 27th 1999) focus obsessively on the legal-procedural minutiae of the Law Lords' ruling, obfuscating any socio-political consequences that may have arisen from the legal process. Again, this reflects the process of particularisation described by Žižek in his debate with Laclau. It also reflects the insights given by jurisprudence literature on neoliberalism. By reducing the case to one defined by legal mechanisms and arguments, the entire issue is reduced to one that may only be approached by legal experts and scholars, thus meaning it is closed off and protected from popular dissent and contestation, a hallmark of neoliberal new constitutionalism. The very same process can be observed through a Lacanian-inspired lens. The legal process is further upheld as embodying the discourse of the University, one that cannot be contested by "subjective" politics.

At the same time, other articles focus squarely on the economic crisis that Chile, and much of Latin America, was facing in the late 1990s. In an article published in March 1998, the case is made that the economic downturn in Chile is a direct consequence of a similar downturn affecting East Asian economies: 'the economy has come under strain. Chile is especially vulnerable to East Asia's woes' (March 7th, 1998: 71-72). Despite pretending to offer an unbiased look at whether the "Chilean model" has been a success and turned the economy into a robust one able to withstand external shocks, the article is wholly one-sided (as indicated by the title 'Chile: All Good Things Must Slow Down'). While the article is almost entirely economy-focussed, it is the comments the author makes on the political situation that are most striking. It first paints the picture of Chile as a centrist, liberal haven:

> 'Chile has also appeared to offer a model of political concord. Backed by the broad alliance known as the Concertacion, centre-left governments, today's one headed by President Eduardo Frei, a cautious Christian Democrat, have left intact the market-driven economy established by the dictatorship, while spending more on education and health' (*ibid.*: 71)

This is the result, it is alleged, of the political extremism of Allende and Pinochet (note the equivalence by the author):

> 'The democrats among its elite have an aversion to extremism, bred of a national trauma – the attempt by the elected President Salvador Allende to make a socialist revolution, and his bloody overthrow in 1973 by General Pinochet' (*ibid.*: 71)

It is then proposed that the only significant opposition to the government in Chile is the conservative right, which criticises the government for not being free market enough:

> 'This slowdown is still awkward for Mr Frei and his government. It coincides with an increasingly noisy argument about economic policy. The commonest criticism, heard mainly (but not solely) from supporters of General Pinochet, is that the government is slowly eroding both Chile's hard-won international competitiveness and its fiscal virtue' (*ibid.*: 72)

This gives the impression that Chile is a country divided by free market advocates and even freer market advocates. The more extreme neoliberal advocates are given the moniker 'critics', as if other forms of critics do not exist in Chile: 'Critics say the government should have tightened fiscal policy to lower inflation' (*ibid.*: 72). The article also laments these critics as being unfavourable to any form of change, when in reality it was these actors who brought about the radical change during the 1970s and 1980s: 'Most chilean conservatives fiercely oppose change of any kind' (*ibid*.: 72). A more accurate description would be, 'people totally against any change that is anti-free market'. All of this serves one common purpose: the universalisation of Chile's neoliberalism. The article certainly interweaves political and economic discussion but does so in a specific and targeted way that maintains the structuring of Chile as a neoliberal society as an incontestable truth. This article is a linguistic act of sealing neoliberal ideology as a demonstrable reality.

In late 1999 Chile faced a presidential election and naturally this took up much of *The Economist*'s focus in its coverage of the country. The final Chile-centred article published in 1999 is dedicated to dissecting the election results which provoked a runoff election in January following a marked increase in votes for the centre-right candidate Joaquín Lavín. The article makes the bold statement that, 'the presidential election has torn up the pattern of a decade of Chile's rebounded democracy' (December 18th, 1999: 51). It is true that in the two previous elections no runoff was required due to the decisive victories for the centre-left *Concertación* coalition, however, the political earthquake that *The Economist* describes stops there. Despite its best attempts, the article fails to draw out meaningful difference between the candidates:

> 'Mr Lagos…ran a worthy but old-fashioned campaign, promising voters a fairer society, built gradually through positive discrimination for the disadvantaged, better state education and improved health services. Mr Lavín, by contrast, skillfully cashed in on the government's misfortunes. For all his commitment to market economics, he ran a campaign tinged by populism, offering tangible improvements, such as jobs and better services' (*ibid.*: 51)

Here there is no tangible difference between the centre-left's Lagos and centre-right's Lavín. Both adhere to free market economics with minimal state intervention. Yet the yearning to create a sense of variation between the two is indicative of a desire to demonstrate that meaningful, competitive politics can exist in neoliberal Chile. It is an attempt to manufacture and imbue a politicisation that has been so thoroughly and so purposefully stripped from the both the state and wider society.

The Economist is not so subtle in its support for Mr Lavín, which is unsurprising given the magazine's long-standing allegiance to the free-market right. What are surprising are the terms in which Lavín is exalted. Towards the end of the article the author states

> 'Like General Pinochet himself, he [Lavín] has little time for political parties, favouring decisive action…He said that he would pick his government from among the most able, irrespective of political allegiance' (*ibid.*: 52)

The author here drifts back to similar language previously used by *The Economist* in its endorsement of Pinochet in the 1970s and early 1980s. Lavín is praised for his supposedly apolitical character and distrust of political parties that are implied as being too ideological. The language used is distinctly reminiscent of the immediate post-coup era during which Pinochet and his junta were welcomed for being managerial and technocratic rather than political. The implication is again that politics gets in the way of good governance and that what is politically expedient is not necessarily commensurate to stability and economic growth. The return of this kind of language is all the more noteworthy when it is taken into account that during this time Chile was faced with an economic downturn. Though this downturn was not nearly as catastrophic as the one experienced in the early 1970s during the Allende years, the economic context of the 1999 election shares this important similarity with that period. *The Economist* is not calling for a return to military rule to realign the Chilean economy, however what it is calling for is a return to a similar form of governance stripped of its political capacity. It is important to highlight that, given the now constitutionally embedded free market foundations of the Chilean state, *The Economist* is comfortable that such a return is possible under existing liberal democratic structures rather than requiring military intervention. This article serves as a gentle ideological reminder that the state is to be no longer conceptualised as a political institution or to be treated as a political football, but as a tool to be used to maximise (neo)liberal economic structures. In the words of Kelsen, the neoliberal *grundnorm* has been established. In the words of Lacan, the neoliberal structuring of the Symbolic is firmly justified by the discourse of the University.

ix. Concluding remarks

This chapter explores how the Right in the United Kingdom used political discourse to embed and support neoliberal ideology. This is examined by scrutinising the changing nature and form of coverage of Chilean politics by the leading right-wing news magazine *The Economist* between 1970 and 1999. Several themes emerge in this chapter that require consolidating. Firstly, there is a stark contrast between pre-coup and post-coup coverage in *The Economist*. Prior to 1973, the Allende regime was lambasted for having deleterious effects upon Chile, predominantly upon its economy. Post-coup, however, the state is stripped of political

capacity and the political and the economic are immediately delineated. Interpreted through a Lacanian-inspired lens, what is observed is an upholding of the discourse of the University to sustain and justify the impending neoliberal turn in Chile. Chile's new regime is articulated as necessary, technocratic and the only way forward. This compliments existing CPE literature that also identifies neoliberalism as an economic agenda that upholds certain policies and programmes (namely privatisation, monetarism, deregulation and so on) as if they were incontestable scientific fact. A further preliminary conclusion is also offered up: it is observed that the neoliberal turn in discourse preceded the neoliberal turn in policy, indicating that the neoliberal project was justified first by ideologically imbued narratives and rhetoric, rather than by any supposed successes of the project itself.

What also emerges from the analysis is a re-articulation of the subject, the Chilean citizen. This is noticeable in two areas. Firstly, in a special supplement published by *The Economist* in 1980, articles dedicated to lauding the supposed economic benefits of the junta's neoliberal agenda demonstrate a process of individualisation. In exalting the economic opportunities supposedly provided by Chile's neoliberal turn, the supplement demonstrates a re-articulation and re-conceptualisation of the political subject (in this case, the Chilean citizen) of one of commanded individuality, whereby the subject is imbued with a sense of individual power and responsibility. Interpreted through a Lacanian lens, this process further supports the idea that neoliberalism's ruse rests upon imbuing the subject with an erroneous sense of their own mastery, operationalised through capitalist consumption. This echoes with existing governmentality approaches which perceive neoliberalism as a form of governance that controls the subject through this very same process of commanded individuality qua consumer choice. This process also emerges in coverage of violent opposition to the regime. Said opposition is given negative descriptors such as 'terrorist' and 'irrational', and the responsibility for any future transition to democracy is placed squarely on the shoulders of civilians. In other words, the subject is commanded to behave responsibly.

A final theme that emerges is that of the depoliticisation of legal structures. This specifically emerges following the ratification of the 1980 constitution. This again follows in line with the Lacanian-inspired critique of neoliberal ideology as a manipulation of discourse: law is imbued with the discourse of the University. However, it also echoes the insights of jurisprudential approaches to neoliberalism, namely the new constitutional approach and the insights of Kelsen's *grundnorm* thesis. The constitution is removed from any critique by *The Economist*, meaning it is sealed off from contestation. This gives the impression that the legal parameters enforced by the constitution comprise of a *grundnorm*, a basic norm that cannot be challenged. This is reinforced once more in coverage of Pinochet's indictment, which is portrayed by *The Economist* as an issue far removed from the understanding of the average person, one that is tied up in legal procedure that can only be penetrated by practitioners of law. The indictment is thus stripped of its political context, meaning it is merely something to be observed. In doing this, the human rights issue has been particularised. Following the insights into neoliberal fantasy and ideology offered by Žižek, the removal of the human rights struggle from the overarching struggle against neoliberalism only serves to reinforce neoliberal ideology.

This chapter establishes the operation of neoliberal ideology through the eyes of a sympathetic mouthpiece, *The Economist*. This allows for the establishment of themes and

tropes which are searched for in the analysis of the primary source material under study in this thesis: left-wing newspaper and journal articles covering the Chilean experience. This chapter acts as a test case against which the following three chapters can be compared and contrasted.

5. The state, governance and governmentality

i. Introduction

This chapter marks the beginning of the analysis of the principal source material with which this thesis is concerned, namely articles from newspapers, magazines and journals of Leftist (defined by this thesis as those overtly and directly opposing capitalism) British groups. This chapter is one of three which concerns this source material and is dedicated to exploring and analysing the shifts in discourse amongst the British Left around the concept of the state. As is elucidated in the first chapter, existing critical approaches to neoliberalism fall into three broad camps: governance and governmentality, jurisprudence and (critical) political economy. As such, the analysis of the source material in this thesis is organised around the concepts of state, law and economy. This is further supported by the findings of the previous chapter in which it is found that these three concepts underwent a radical re-imagination and re-articulation according to neoliberal ideological tropes. The following three chapters are each dedicated to one of these concepts, and a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis is applied and used to mediate each of the three aforementioned critical approaches to neoliberalism. This chapter concerns conceptualisations of the state and governance, and therefore the analysis combines the governmentality approach with said Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis of the source material.

This chapter follows a historiographical trajectory, in keeping with the previous analytical chapter. Following such a structure allows for a keen examination of how and when ideological transformation on the Left began to take hold and cement itself. It also allows for a useful comparison between the three concepts of state, economy and law insofar as it opens the possibility for establishing whether one or more of these concepts was re-imagined and re-oriented at a quicker pace or earlier stage than the others. The sources analysed in this chapter were selected from the date ranges established in chapter two and the chapter is structured as follows: section ii, 1970-71; section iii, 1973-74; section iv, 1979-80 and 1984-85; section v.,1990-91. Concluding remarks are made in section vi. Sections iv and v contain two sets of data due to the lesser amounts of source material available during these date ranges. Said structure allows for an easy to follow analysis of how and when neoliberal ideology began to profoundly influence left wing anti-capitalist political discourse around the conceptualisation, imagination and understanding of the state and the state's role in political, economic and societal arenas.

ii. 1970-1971: the Left's deep embrace of Marxist state theory

The election of Salvador Allende to Chile's presidency and his time in office quickly became a key topic of interest for the diverse groups on the left of British politics. Allende represented to them an opportunity to see the idea of socialism by the ballot box (the 'peaceful road to Socialism' (Acuña 2015: 409)) play out in real time. In other words, the Unidad Popular (UP) government served as an experiment for the Left to see whether the age-old debate about socialist strategy could be resolved once and for all. As such, many groups dedicated column inches in their newspapers, magazines and journals to covering Allende's administration. It is important to note that the British left was broadly divided into two schools of thought on the UP: those who wholeheartedly backed the government; and those who, without wishing it to

fail per se, warned of its inevitable failure. These two broad groupings follow those split on either side of the socialist strategy debate. The Communist Party of Great Britain, which advocated a "peaceful road" to socialism, keenly embraced the UP while those who advocated the revolutionary road – more or less everyone else on the British left – predicted its demise. While this clear difference in attitude to the UP – and by extension to socialist political strategy more generally – is quite apparent in the material consulted by this thesis, what is also clear is that the British Left universally accepted a common understanding of liberal democratic states, namely that they are inherently political constructs. Specifically, the Left interpreted the Chilean state as being constructed around the interests of the Chilean bourgeoisie[16] meaning it therefore was inherently pro-capitalism and anti-socialism and working-class politics. Alfredo Garcia, writing in *Intercontinental Press* – the weekly news magazine of the Fourth International (FI) and associated with the British section of the FI, the International Marxist Group (IMG) – stated that the Chilean state,

> '…has successively incorporated the ruling classes into its apparatus, disciplining them and regulating the conflicts of the various layers…While in general the state represents the ruling class, in our history the ruling classes are consubstantial with the state, fusing with it into a bureaucratised bourgeois class which faces all vicissitudes as a bloc' (Garcia October 5th 1971: 822)

An article published in *Red Mole*, the newspaper of IMG, focused on the difficulties faced by the UP government in dealing with the Chilean state apparatus:

> 'Since he came to power, Allende has taken some steps in the spheres of hot policy, foreign policy and the economy. In each case, these alternatives are immediately posed: destruction of the bourgeois state or a limitation to the application of the Programme' (*Red Mole* February 1st-15th 1971: 9)

Even in publications sympathetic to the UP – those of the CPGB – it was openly admitted that the Chilean state was inherently representative of the ruling classes and their interests. An article in *Morning Star*, the daily newspaper of the CPGB, claimed that Chile had 'the most highly developed bourgeois democracy of all Latin America' (*Morning Star* September 4th, 1970: 4). This interpretation of the state was echoed in an article published in *Marxism Today* (a theoretical journal associated with the CPGB) the following year. In it, the author appraised the first six months of Allende's government, writing,

> 'In its first six months of office the Popular Unity Government has proved that it is capable of leading Chilean society to socialism along what is called a "peaceful" road. Of course, the word "peaceful" is not either an exact or an accurate one. The road is not exactly "peaceful"; it has not been peaceful; and it will not be peaceful. The word is meant to indicate that in Chile it has been possible to get to socialism first by a combination of electoral victory and mass struggle and by transforming the bourgeois institutions. As is known the word "peaceful" has been used to describe a road

[16] In this chapter and the remaining chapters of this thesis, the term 'bourgeoisie' shall be used interchangeably with the term 'ruling classes' and shall be used to denote the propertied classes whose interests lie in the preservation of the capitalist mode of production

> different from "violent" or "armed" revolution, which has often been considered the only way in Latin America to defeat capitalism' (Duran July 1971: 204)

What is established here is a universal and profound application of Marxist state theory that interprets liberal democratic states as being constructs that ensure bourgeois domination of society and the successful implementation of the capitalist economic model (Corrigan 1980; Barrow 1993; 2000)[17]. Going further, this interpretation of the state also assumes that states are inherently political insofar as they operate in the capacity of acting on behalf of a section of society and not society as a whole. They are therefore not understood as neutral arbiters that can be occupied and utilised to their full effect by different actors. They are therefore not understood as neutral arbiters that can be occupied and utilised to their full effect by different actors. This understanding of the state compliments the Lacanian-inspired approach to power relations and, more specifically, the Four Discourses, set out in chapter three of this thesis. The state here is understood by the Left as embodying the discourse of the Master. It has a power that both reflects and acts on the power relations between the bourgeoisie and the working class, maintaining the balance of power in the favour of the ruling classes. The autonomous mastery of the state is also reflected in the Left's understanding of what the state can do. In praising what he sees as an ambitious programme, Duran writes that, 'Popular Unity from the government downwards must defeat the bourgeoisie, the big farmers and North American imperialism with the weapons at the disposal of the Executive power' (*ibid.*: 206). The state is seen by the author in *Marxism Today* as having the power to affect the composition of the Chilean social body. Even in publications less embracing of the UP, this assumption is made:

> 'For the workers and poor peasants of Chile, the September victory of Salvador Allende, on a programme of land reform and the nationalisation of the banks, insurance companies and other major industries promised an end to the starvation and squalor in which the vast majority were living' (Craven March 1971: 2)

The state is seen as having the capability of solving complex socio-economic and political issues such as poverty and under-industrialisation, and therefore the state is capable of leading society to a more utopian form. What is up for debate amongst the Left is seemingly whether the longterm survival of the government is feasible or not through adhering to constitutional politics. In other words, the debate centres around whether it is *this* state that can affect change, or if another is needed. Regardless, the concept of the state, in the abstract, is seen as the vehicle through which change is delivered. Subjected to a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, the state as a concept is seen as embodying the Master, the all-powerful entity that affects change to the social body and therefore the subject. As the climate of tension intensifies in Chile in 1973 (with the coup occurring in September of that year), this form of state interpretation intensifies also as the Left appears to stick to its ideological guns.

[17] To call this form of state interpretation simply 'Marxist state theory' without explanation would be to dismiss the complexities and nuanced differences between various Marx-influenced state analytical approaches. However, for simplicity and to keep this chapter focussed on the task at hand, this research shall refer to the above interpretation of the state as such.

iii. 1973-1974: The Marxist analysis deepens

1973-74 witnessed the largest amount of coverage by British left-wing publications of Chilean politics of the source material analysed. During this time, the aforementioned utilisation of Marxist state theory by the Left when discussing Chile deepened, with much of the focus of writers taken up by the Chilean armed forces. Even prior to the September coup this was the case as Allende invited high ranking members of the armed forces into his cabinet. This move was interpreted by those critical of the UP as a grave mistake. An article in *Red Weekly* (formerly *Red Mole*) claimed that, 'the inclusion of the military in Allende's new government of 9 August marks the end of three years of government by a coalition of parties of the working class, and a major advance for the counter-revolution' (*Red Weekly* August 17th 1973: 7). The armed forces are understood as an actor profoundly political in character, constructed as a last line of defence for bourgeois interests. In an article published a week later in *Red Weekly*, Jane Frazer calls the armed forces, 'the capitalists' army' (Frazer August 31st 1973: 7), and an article in *Intercontinental Press* claimed that the Chilean army was, 'the last line of defence for the capitalist system' (*Intercontinental Press* June 25th 1973: 765). What is being witnessed here is a deepening of the Marxist state theory utilised across the British Left. It is not only the state that is being interpreted as a political actor, but institutions within it are being understood as actors in and of themselves with their own political characteristics. Such an interpretation was much repeated in the aftermath of the coup. In its first edition published after the coup, an article in *Militant* claimed that, 'the capitalists have thus used their military power to destroy the reforms instituted by the "Popular Unity" government' (*Militant* September 14th, 1973: 1). *International Socialism* (theoretical journal of the International Socialists (IS), now the Socialist Workers Party (SWP)) sought to fit the armed forces within a wider framework of a capitalist state, locating their political role alongside other institutions that held similar political manifestations:

> 'The state machine in even the most democratic bourgeois states is built on strictly hierarchic principles, with control over the activities of the army, the police and the civil service concentrated in the hands of the relatives and friends of those who hold economic power. And the ruling class will use this machine to re-establish its own, untrammelled domination the moment it feels the balance of forces are favourable to it' (Birchall & Harman 1973)

Again, this is a motif shared by those of a more favourable opinion towards the UP. British Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm wrote in *Marxism Today* that, 'the moral…so far is that armed forces, even quite small and not notably efficient armed forces, cannot be wished into insignificance' (Hobsbawm October 1974: 304). To return to a Lacanian-inspired analysis, what is seen here is the further imbuing of the state with the discourse of the Master, but also an imbuing with said discourse of individual state institutions. The Left in the early 1970s imagined the state as a complex actor equipped with a totality of power that was the sum of smaller parts, each themselves equipped with a certain autonomous mastery. All the while, the perception of the state as an actor that can directly mould the Chilean social base remains. Prior to the coup, an article appeared in *Militant* which clearly demonstrated this view of the state as one with a great power to affect wider society: 'Allende does have the instruments [to affect social change] but he lacks the perspective to use them' (Pickard July 6th 1973: 6).

It is important to make a comparison at this point with the findings in the previous chapter relating to *The Economist*. It was noted that almost as soon as the coup had taken place, and the UP government had been resolutely deposed and replaced by a military junta, *The Economist* immediately embarked upon a radical depoliticisation of the state, marking a clear transference of the discourse of power (the Master) with the discourse of objectivity, rationality and science (the University). It is concluded that, as a leading mouthpiece for neoliberalism, *The Economist* was quick in laying the foundations for the neoliberal counter-revolution that was taking place in Chile, but which was also about to take place in the United Kingdom with the election of Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister six years later. The implication of this was that the shift in discourse acted as a precursor to the implementation of neoliberal policies. What is evident here is that the British Left did not follow this path of immediately submitting to neoliberal discoursal transference. This can be easily understood when the British political context is taken into account. While September 1973 marked the end of a social democratic political era in Chile, it did not mark such an end in the United Kingdom. By contrast, the United Kingdom was still governed by Ted Heath's Conservative Party which was then replaced by Harold Wilson's Labour Party in 1974. Despite falling on different sides of the political aisle, both administrations largely embraced the by now well-established doctrine of post-war consensus capitalism, a permutation of capitalism that promoted the state as an active participant in social, political and economic life (Kavanagh 1987; 1992).

It is therefore not surprising that the anti-capitalist Left in Britain did not wholly embrace the new parameters of neoliberal discourse considering it was still existing in a pre-neoliberal context. However, as shall be explored in the remainder of this chapter, as that pre-neoliberal context transforms into a neoliberal one at the end of the 1970s/beginning of the 1980s, the Left's politicisation of the state begins to waver.

iv. The 1980s and the creeping influence of neoliberalism on Leftist discourse

The years of 1979 and 1980 were landmark ones in both the UK and Chile. In the UK Margaret Thatcher was elected as Prime Minister in 1979 and is identified by this research as beginning the age of neoliberalism in that country. In 1980 in Chile, General Pinochet, now officially head of state, organised a plebiscite that returned a favourable result allowing for the implementation of a new constitution, a constitution that is widely regarded as consolidating not just his power, but also imprinting on the country certain key features of free market economics (Barros 2002). In other words, what these two years represent is the birth of neoliberalism in one of the key centres of capitalism (the UK) and the consolidation of neoliberalism in its first experiment (Chile). Before this point it was established in this chapter that the Left, through their coverage and analysis of Chilean politics between the years of 1970-71 and 1973-74, politicised the state in two ways. Firstly, the state was interpreted as being inherently political insofar as it was constructed with the expressly political aim of protecting and advancing capitalist interests. This was understood through a Marxist interpretation of state institutions. Secondly, the state was seen as political insofar as it had the capabilities to directly affect the social body through policy. In contrast to *The Economist*, neither of these two forms of politicised interpretation wavered in the wake of the 1973 coup and the beginning of the implementation of neoliberalism in Chile. As will now be explored, both these forms of analysis become blurred as the 1970s ends and the 1980s begins.

What is most evident when analysing the source material from the years of 1979-80 and 1984-85 is that the Left no longer uniformly follows a single interpretation of the state. For some, the political character of state institutions, particularly armed forces, remains at the forefront of their analysis. In an article published in *Socialist Challenge* (formerly *Red Weekly* and *Red Mole*) which compared the Iranian revolution of 1979 with the Salvador Allende-led UP government of 1970-73, John Ross wrote,

> 'The working class can smash even the most well trained and politically prepared modern army. That is one of the many lessons of Iran. This puts into place all the propaganda of the Communist Parties and their insistence on the "peaceful road to socialism". It is impossible to defeat the military, they have declared…Instead, they have told us, we must ally with progressive generals and officers. And at all costs avoid a clash with the armed forces. And this advice has been put into practice. Chile is the most obvious example" (Ross February 15th, 1979: 5)

Note the use of the phrase 'politically prepared modern army'. The implication is that armed forces are inherently political in their character, formed with the political aim of protecting bourgeois interests. Even several years later, in the mid 1980s, some on the left persisted with this Marxist-influenced political characterisation of state institutions. Mike Gonzalez wrote in *International Socialism,* 'the protagonists of the Chilean experience of 1970-73 were not nations but classes, whose struggle and conflict reached a new and unprecedented level. The solution of September was a class solution' (Gonzalez 1984). Here, the use of the word 'solution' is particularly important. Recall earlier that the Left, in the immediate aftermath of the coup, interpreted the military intervention as a form of 'last resort' option exercised by the Chilean ruling classes. It was their nuclear option. Again, 11 years later, similar language is still being used in some quarters on the Left.

Crucially, however, this view of the state as a unit the sum of its politically inscribed parts is not maintained by all. Earlier it was mentioned that the major event in Chile at this time was the plebiscite to approve – and the concurrent implementation of – Pinochet's new constitution that not only guaranteed his place as head of state for at least another eight years, but also guaranteed the neoliberal-capitalist orientation of the country. This was covered in an article in *Socialist Challenge* in September 1980:

> 'The constitution…secures Pinochet in power for at least the next eight years and allows him a further period of office up to 1997. Even after the eight-year "transition to democracy", Pinochet can veto any decision of Congress, or simply rule without it under a "state of mobilization", "state of siege", "state of emergency", or "state of catastrophe"' (Hughes September 25th, 1980: 10)

The analysis of the new constitution is conspicuous in its absence. The author here has merely described new powers that allow Pinochet to remain in office for as long as he pleases. The state, therefore, is no longer being understood in its capacity as an actor that guarantees the protection and advancement of capitalist interests, but instead as a tool that is being misused and manipulated by an autocratic leader. This political capacity has been stripped from the state. This is also evident in an article published by the *New Left Review* journal in 1979. The

article – titled 'The Travail of Latin American Democracy' – does not deal with the new constitution, or even with Chile specifically, but instead with the recurrence of military governments in Latin America. The author concludes that,

> 'The prevalence of dictatorships and large-scale violent repression is, first of all, a manifestation of the failure of the Latin American bourgeoisie to establish democracy for itself, and not primarily of its failure to contain the popular classes by other means than open state terror…The basic explanation of the travail of Latin American democracy must be sought in the weakness of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie' (Therborn 1979: 74)

Military governments are, according to Therborn, not a last-ditch attempt at maintaining the political control of the ruling classes, they are instead an indication of the failure of those ruling classes to establish control in the first place. This line of thinking emerges again in 1985 in an article published in *Militant*: 'The Chilean bourgeois have completely lost control of the state apparatus. A military bonapartist regime, it has risen above society, defending private property but without direct control by the bourgeois themselves' (*Militant* February 1st, 1985: 8). The Chilean military government is therefore only occupying a vacuum left by unresolved class conflict. This analysis echoes quite closely the analysis proffered by *The Economist* during this period. It is discussed in chapter four how, by the mid 1980s, *The Economist* was clamouring for a return to liberal democracy in Chile. Its calls, however, put the blame on the centrist opposition for not proposing a viable alternative to military rule. It was concluded that this reflected *The Economist's* depoliticisation of the Chilean state under Pinochet. The junta was portrayed as being an apolitical force, propping up Chilean society and preventing it from falling into chaos which would be inevitable as the bourgeoisie had failed to construct a robust state of its own. The junta therefore was interpreted as sitting above politics. Remarkably, this very same trope of neoliberal ideology has emerged on the Left at this time too. In fact, the article explicitly references the junta as having 'risen above society'.

By subjecting this to a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, it is clear that neoliberal ideology has, by the 1980s, begun to penetrate Leftist political discourse. The Chilean state is no longer seen by some Leftist writers as embodying the discourse of the Master. The military junta is no longer the autocratic articulation of capitalist interests. It is instead a stop gap, an option of last resort, not for the bourgeoisie, but for society as a whole, that sits above it holding it together and preventing its imminent collapse. In Lacanian terms, the Chilean state now embodies the Lacanian discourse of the University. It is now a dispassionate entity that fulfils a societal necessity, of keeping the country together. Of course, it would be wrong to equate the analysis of *The Economist* with those of similar tone on the Left. *The Economist* remained sympathetic to the objectives of Pinochet's regime, whereas the Left certainly did not. However, the underlying assumption of the junta acting as an apolitical force remains the same. This can also be linked to existing governmentality approaches to neoliberal capitalism. In positioning the state as apolitical and as existing beyond the parameters and confines of politics, responsibility for the state's egregious actions no longer lies with the state or its constituent actors. These actions are instead, by implication, a result of the behaviour of Chilean subjects. The imminent collapse of Chilean society is the result of the actions of individual Chileans. This echoes the criticism levelled at the UP government and its supporters by *The Economist*. Responsibility is therefore imputed onto the individual subject, not the

state and its pro-capitalist motivation and manifestations. There is a common thread that weaves the governmentality approach with the Lacanian-inspired analysis of discourses: power and responsibility is transferred from the state onto the subject.

Furthermore, for those Leftist writers who have adopted this new understanding of the state, the interpretation of the state as having powers to directly affect the Chilean social body also appears to have fallen by the wayside. In the mid 1980s Chile faced a profound economic crisis. The Chilean state is now seen as an entity whose actions merely made this crisis worse rather than one whose actions created it:

> 'The ruling class, the Junta itself, is split from top to bottom. This has arisen from the catastrophe which confronts Chilean society in every sphere, and has been aggravated by the monetarist measures so enthusiastically applied in Pinochet's early years' (Woods April 27th, 1984: 10)

Woods does not blame the junta for creating the economic crisis, only for "aggravating" it. There is no mention of what caused the economic downturn, nor what the junta could have done to prevent it. The implication is that, through bad policy, rather than softening the impact of the economic crisis, the state has just made it worse. The significance of this is multi-faceted. Firstly, the state cannot resolutely affect the fabric of the Chilean social body, it can only insulate it from external problems. Secondly, there is such a thing as good and bad policy. This second point necessitates further examination. In the early 1970s, during the time of the UP government and immediately after the September 1973 coup, the Left discussed the need to defeat capitalism in absolutist terms. Articles such as 'Chile: For a real Worker's Government' (Coxhead October 1970), 'The Real Perspective Facing the Chilean Masses' (*Intercontinental Press* January 25th 1971), 'Chile junta welcome for US monopolies (*Morning Star* September 21st 1973) and 'How the rich rejoiced at Chilean coup' (Russell September 27th 1973) talked about how the task of the UP government was to eradicate capitalism from Chile, and how the coup was a manoeuvre to protect the capitalist system in that country. Now, with the introduction of the idea that such a thing as "good" and "bad" public policy exists, there is a new understanding of the state and its relationship to economic and social systems. In the early 1970s anti-capitalist political agendas were not talked about in such normative terms. Now, it appears that they are. 'Monetarism', according to Woods, has not seemingly created the economic crisis, it has made it worse. By extension, therefore, anti-monetarist policies would have made the economic crisis more tolerable. This new normative and anti-political treatment of economics will be discussed in much greater detail in chapter seven, where the issue of economic discourse shall be explored at length.

Before going on to discuss the analysis of the source material from the 1990s, it is prudent to take stock of what has been established thus far. In the early 1970s the Left, regardless of its opinion of the UP government in Chile, interpreted the state through a distinctly political lens. The state was universally understood as being a construction of bourgeois interests, made up of institutions whose role was to protect said interests and which had the power (the mastery in Lacanian terminology) to directly shape the Chilean social body. As the 1970s turns into the 1980s, this universally embraced Marxist state analysis becomes less widespread. There are some who still evoke this interpretation of the state, particularly that of the state as a manifestation of capitalist interests. However, others on the Left began to drop this approach

and instead adopt an apolitical reading of the state, very much in line with that observed in *The Economist*. Notably, the state was seen as acting above politics and state policy was understood as not doing much more than "tinkering around the edges" of social problems. This reflects a move towards neoliberalism as an ideology as ideological tropes identified as neoliberal by this research project are adopted by some Leftists. It is also important to note that those who move away from previous Marxist state analyses are not restricted to one part of the Left, or even one organisation. The penetration of neoliberal ideology on the Left does not appear at this stage to have been more successful in certain Leftist sects than others. As shall be described in the remainder of this chapter, in the 1990s the Left in the UK broadly adopts these neoliberal parameters around discourses of the state.

v. The Left crumbles to neoliberal ideological norms

In 1990 Chile completes its transition to liberal democracy, a process that began with a national plebiscite on continuing Pinochet's rule in 1988 and that ended with the beginning of democratically elected President Patricio Aylwin's presidential term in March 1990. As such, discussions of the state naturally formed around discussions and analyses of Chile's democratic transition. The transition took place under the framework instituted by Pinochet's 1980 constitution, and therefore Chilean democracy today is profoundly shaped by General Pinochet and his junta. Certain articles of the constitution have either been reformed or repealed since the resumption of liberal democracy 1990. Crucially, where Leftist politics is concerned, the constitution, in its original 1980 form, prohibited, through Article 8, organisations and movements that propagated revolutionary political praxis based on class politics. In other words, Article 8 banned Marxism as a political ideology and imprinted on the country an unavoidable, constitutionally guaranteed acceptance of capitalism and bourgeois democracy. Article 8 was eventually repealed and replaced with entirely new text in 2005 ('Reforma Constitucional' 2005). However, it is important to keep in mind that the source material analysed in this subsection was written during a time when Marxism was illegal in Chile. Given this, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the anti-capitalist Left in the UK would, when reporting on Chile's new-found democratic character, call into question the nature of its new democracy. This, however, was not the case. Two days before the inauguration of Patricio Aylwin, an article appeared in *Militant* that discussed the imminent democratic renewal of Chile. Rather than cast a skeptical or critical eye over the transition, the author resolutely backs the process:

> 'On 11 March power is handed to Chile's first elected government since 1973. This is a massive victory for the workers and youth, who have played the main role in the struggle against the dictatorship' (Barros March 9th, 1990: 10)

The assertion above is debatable at best. While it is not wrong to state that workers and youth organisations played a leading role in anti-Pinochet demonstrations and activities during the lifespan of the military government (trade unions, Leftist parties and students groups certainly played a prominent role in such activities (Figueroa Clark 2015)), the author is implying that as these organisations played an important role and are now deemed legal under the new liberal democratic order, the transition to democracy is therefore a workers' victory. This is quite extraordinary when it is taken into consideration just how dismissive and critical *Militant* has been of these organisations in the past (particularly the leading Leftist

parties – the *Partido Socialista* and *Partido Communista*). Particularly after the 1973 coup, *Militant* was awash with articles condemning the parties of the Chilean Left for betraying the workers (Pickard July 6th, 1973; *Militant* September 14th 1973; Silverman September 21st 1973; September 28th 1973). Years later, the most remarkable of about-turns has been made. The parties that had originally betrayed the workers (by allowing the coup to happen) have now become the saviours of the working class (by delivering a return to liberal democracy). Furthermore, there is no questioning or analysis of the type of democracy to which Chile is returning. Again, in the past *Militant* was quick to label the pre-1973 Chilean state as a bourgeois state, as one constructed to protect bourgeois interests and, ultimately, capitalism. Now, this form of liberal democracy is hailed as a 'victory for workers.'

What can be gathered here from this one article is a sense that the political divisions of Chile have been recast during the Pinochet era. No longer is Chilean politics to be read by the Left along class lines, but along the lines of pro and anti-democracy. This is also seen in a much smaller article published in the *Morning Star* two days after Aylwin's inauguration. The article begins by stating that, 'Patricio Aylwin, Chile's first elected president since the 1973 fascist coup, began work yesterday after a tumultuous welcome in Santiago turned into clashes between democrats and the police' (*Morning Star* March 13th, 1990: 2). The article continues, 'crowds that had been waiting several hours for a sight of their new leader burst through barriers just minutes before Mr Aylwin was due to speak from the balcony of the Moneda presidential palace' (*ibid.*: 2). Two things must be highlighted here. Firstly, the portrayal of the clashes as being between 'democrats and the police' is significant. This is a subtle redrawing of political lines in Chilean politics by the *Morning Star* author. There is no use of words such as working class, or bourgeoisie or any other lexicon familiar to those formerly adept at employing Marxist-based class analyses. The tone of the article strikes as one of "good guys versus bad guys", "the right versus the wrong" rather than "the Right versus the Left". The implicit casting of 'the police' as being anti-democrat is at least a recognition that the state security services, including the police, enjoyed a formerly privileged position under the Pinochet regime. However, there is no recognition that said security services are now under the control of the democrat now occupying the Moneda palace. Instead, Aylwin is depicted in a similarly righteous manner to those involved in clashes with the police. The idea that the crowds that had gathered at the palace had waited for 'several hours for a sight of their new leader' strikes a quasi-religious tone. Indeed, the quote would not appear out of place in an article covering the resolution of a papal conclave. The idea of morality and righteousness being on the side of liberal democracy echoes right wing narratives around the Chilean transition at the time. It was noted in chapter four how, in one article ('The New Latin Beat' (March 17th 1990)), *The Economist* equated Chile's new democracy, its creator General Pinochet, and the new economic reality of the country (free market economics) with the highest plain of liberty. This idea appears to emerge at the same time on the Left, with the new Chilean democracy and its coterminous economic reality being a victory for workers and also being the "right" or "correct" form of socio-political and economic orientation. This evokes the insights offered by the governmentality approach. Positioning the democratic transition as a victory of right over wrong has concurrent implications for subjectivity. This articulation is a clear continuation of depoliticising the military junta which, as extrapolated earlier, carries an understanding that it is the individual subject that bears the responsibility for the intolerable excesses of autocracy. This burden of responsibility persists here with the articulation of Chile's new liberal democracy as a universally desired state orientation. Now

that democracy has been restored, it is the responsibility of the subject once again to prevent any backwards slip into dictatorship.

The underlying ideological logic behind this articulation is uncovered once again by mediating the governmentality insights through a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis. What is evidenced here is a further depoliticisation of the state through the process of discursive transference. Liberal democracy is now the "right" way to organise society meaning it is not a question of politics or of power, but of right versus wrong. With liberal democracy now being the "correct" way of doing politics, the Chilean state now embodies the discourse of the University. Its liberal democratic manifestation is the correct form of governance. It is no longer understood by the Left as a political manifestation of bourgeois power nor is it an institutional reflection of power relations between classes. The state is not the Master. By extension, therefore, it is the subject that embodies the Master, that has the ability to supposedly protect and uphold this "right" way of organising society through "correct" behaviour within the liberal democratic framework. This discursive transference is also reflected in the Left's change in its perception of what the state can and cannot achieve. Returning to the *Militant* article, it is claimed that,

> 'For most workers "democracy" means change – an end to poverty wages, shorter working hours, at least the possibility of getting a home…The government will increase the minimum wage. They will build some houses. There will be more investment in education' (Barros March 9th, 1990: 10)

At first glance it may appear that the author understands the new Aylwin regime as having the resources to affect some meaningful change, and that it does. However, this does not mean that the state is the Master in the Lacanian sense. On closer inspection, the article is conservative in its language. The incoming government marks an end to 'poverty wages', not poverty; to exploitative working hours, not exploitation; to the impossibility of homeownership, not homelessness. The state is therefore not understood as the agent that can directly and resolutely address complex social crises, but as an agent that can "tinker around the edges" with the limited policy tools it has at its disposal. Overall, the transition to democracy represents 'change', in the words of the author, not revolution. The other implication is that the military autocracy that preceded the Aylwin administration was simply utilising bad policy rather than purposefully and radically reorienting the Chilean social body. If Aylwin is going to 'end poverty wages', then Pinochet did not. There is no discussion as to what such wage exploitation means or represents. In other words, gone are the overarching discussions of capitalism, and in their place are discussions of policy agendas and manifestos – the language of liberal democratic election campaigns. All in all, the analysis offered by the Left during the transition to democracy is that of a beat reporter narrating electoral procedures, and in fact this is another important conclusion to be taken away by this analysis. Not only has the Left accepted the normative language of neoliberalism that permits the depoliticisation of the state through a transference of the discourse of the Master with the discourse of the University, it also reflects the Left's increasing 'particularisation' of Chilean politics. Returning to the Žižek-Laclau debate of the mid-2000s (covered in chapter three), one of Žižek's insights into neoliberalism is that part of the ideological ruse is to deconstruct political struggles into individual units – particularisation – and to then promote and articulate one such struggle into a false universal. This process separates struggles from each other and

from the overarching cause of anti-capitalism to which they are all connected. Struggles have thus moved from the philosophical-political to the legalistic, from operating outside of capitalist norms to within capitalist legal frameworks.

It is quite apparent that the British anti-capitalist Left had abandoned by the 1990s the discussion of Chile as a representation of the universal struggle against capitalism in favour of discussing it as a particular struggle for liberal orientations of the state. In the early 1970s, the Chilean state was read by the Left through a Marxist state theory lens. The Chilean state was a construction to promote and protect capitalist interests, and the coup of 1973 was a last-ditch attempt to rescue Chilean capitalism, and its imperialist benefactors, from a government (Allende's UP) the Chilean and US bourgeoisie viewed as a credible threat to their interests. The UP experience was interpreted by the Left as a useful experiment to be used to help settle the age-old debate about socialist political strategy. In the words of the Žižek-Laclau debate, Chile was a particular representation of the universal anti-capitalist struggle. Fast forward to the 1990s and this has changed markedly. The transition to democracy that culminated in March 1990 was viewed not as another step in the continuation of bourgeois control of Chile, but as a decisive victory and conclusion to the struggle against authoritarianism. There is a feeling in the articles analysed that with Aylwin's inauguration the book is now closed, the game has been won. The fact that there is no overarching discussion within these articles as to the nature of the Chilean transition – specifically how the resumption of liberal democracy does not radically alter the socio-political or economic realities of the life of the Chilean subject – means that the Chilean transition to democracy is now understood by the Left as a false universalisation of a particular. The Chilean transition particular is now the Left's new universal cause of liberal democracy. Not wishing to downplay or underestimate the importance of having secured civil and political rights, it is nonetheless remarkable that the context of the transition is not discussed.

vi. The curious case of the post-Cold War Left

It would be disingenuous to state that every single Leftist publication in the 1990s followed the particularisation of Chilean politics described above. There were a handful of publications that maintained their analyses of Chile through a more "universal" lens. The most prominent publication was the *Socialist Worker*, the newspaper of the SWP. During the 1990s, articles appeared that maintained an analysis of the Chilean transition much more in-keeping with previous analyses seen in earlier decades across multiple Left publications. For example, a large article spanning two pages appeared in *Socialist Worker* in September 1991 called 'They call this democracy' (*Socialist Worker* September 14th 1991). The article criticised not just the Chilean transition, but similar transitions that occurred in many countries in the early 1990s, most notably in Eastern Europe following the breakup of the Soviet Union. The quote below gives an accurate insight into the perspective taken by the unnamed author:

> 'The free market and democracy go together like peaches and cream – that's the picture the media presents, particularly since the failed coup in the USSR. The truth is utterly different. Capitalist societies have, historically, been governed by all kinds of political systems. They stretch from Hitler's Germany though *[sic]* Pinochet's military junta in Chile to US style electoral institutions…Capitalism can survive under a variety

> of political systems. Its only requirement is the stability it needs to establish markets, factories and so on' (*ibid.*: 8-9)

While not focusing on the Chilean transition specifically, the implication – given by the title 'They call this democracy' – is that liberal democracy is an institutional guarantee for capitalism, rather than an end towards which everyone, both Right and Left, should strive. The SWP therefore maintains its political reading of not just the Chilean state, but all states. At the same time, it maintains the view that Chile is a particular representation of the universal anti-capitalist struggle. This is maintained seven years later in another *Socialist Worker* article, titled 'Forced Handover', which looks back at the Chilean transition:

> 'In 1988, when Pinochet wanted an eight year extension to his rule endorsed in a referendum, the move backfired. Chile's bosses and Pinochet himself decided it was better to negotiate a transition to a more stable regime than risk further revolts. So in 1990 they allowed elections under a new constitutional arrangement, and the Christian Democrat Patricio Aylwin became president. But the 'transition to democracy' was hedged around with guarantees for Pinochet' (*Socialist Worker* December 5th, 1998: 9)

The linking of Pinochet with 'Chile's bosses' maintains the idea that the military government was in place with the political goal of maintaining and further entrenching capitalism in Chile. Then comes the explicit assertion that not only was the transition to democracy purposefully constructed to maintain the capitalist orientation of the country but was also only permitted when the 1988 plebiscite returned a 'no' vote for continued military rule. A picture is painted of the transition as being permitted by the ruling classes in order to pre-emptively see off any nascent working-class rebellion against the state. The author is implying that the state's transformation to liberal democracy had the effect of preventing major social upheaval. The author of this article still sees the state as embodying the Master as it has clearly evidenced a power in being able to prevent major social reorganisation. The author has not undertaken any transference of the discourses when it comes to understanding the state. The state as the autonomous Master is reinforced in another article published in the same December 5th, 1998 issue:

> 'In societies with a long parliamentary tradition, like Britain today or Chile in 1970, formal power lies with the elected MPs. But real power elsewhere, with the great swathes of the unelected. Army chiefs and air force commanders are not elected. There is no accountability or public control over the police or the top level of the civil service. Above all there is no economic democracy. Private property by its nature is hidden from the public gaze and any social control' (*Socialist Worker* December 5th, 1998: 10)

Again, there is the not so subtle linkage of state institutions (the armed forces) with capitalism (private property).

The idea of 'real power' as being different to 'formal power' held by elected representatives attests to the notion of the state as holding an autonomous Mastery. Another, much smaller organisation called the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG) also maintained a similar line

of analysis. The RCG formed as a result of a split with the International Socialists (now SWP) in 1974 and remains active today. In a late 1998 edition of the group's newspaper *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!*, Robert Clough claimed that, due to the transition, 'a facade of democracy has been restored' (Clough August/September 1998) – a not so subtle hint as to the author's impression of Chile's new liberal democratic orientation. What is interesting to note is that the two groups affiliated with these two newspapers (*Socialist Worker* and the SWP; *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* and the RCG) are both still in existence today. This is in contrast to the plethora of other source material analysed elsewhere in this chapter. The IMG, whose publications were *Red Mole/Red Weekly/Socialist Challenge* and *Intercontinental Press* folded in 1982; Militant, whose newspaper was *Militant*, folded in 1991; and while the *Morning Star* is still going, its affiliation with any group ceased when the CPGB dissolved in 1991 (the CPGB journal *Marxism Today* also folded in that year). Therefore, it appears that those who maintained a universalisation of the Chilean experience in their analyses have managed to continue as organisations, whereas those who adopted neoliberal discursive practices around their conceptualisations of the state folded by the end of the Cold War. One of the explanations for this is something to which Žižek alluded in the Žižek-Laclau debate. Žižek claimed that the failure of all leftist struggles to bring about a post-capitalist society in the post-Cold War era is a reflection of the Left's increasing particularisation of political struggles and their false portrayals as features of the human condition. This, according to Žižek, is one of the prime ideological procedures of neoliberal capitalism:

> 'The ideological procedure *par excellence* is that of *false eternalisation and/or universalisation:* a state which depends on a concrete historical conjunction appears as an eternal universal feature of the human condition; the interest of a particular class disguises itself as a universal human interest' (Žižek 1995: 689)

Thus, through maintaining a politicised interpretation of the post-Pinochet Chilean state (as one of a representation of bourgeois class interests) rather than as an objective feature of the human condition (the natural desirability of liberal democracy), the SWP and the RCG have managed to avoid that neoliberal ideological procedure of particularisation and the concomitant procedure of false universalisation. It would be a step too far to claim definitively that this is the reason why the SWP and RCG have outlived their Leftist contemporaries who demised in the wake of the breakup of the Soviet Union. There is simply not enough source material available from the selections used in this research to make such a concrete claim. However, one further conclusion of this chapter, and therefore of this research, is that any analysis of the near-total collapse of the radical Left in the UK in the early 1990s ought to be read in the context of this struggle to withstand and avoid a total submission to neoliberal discoursal transference. What also must be reflected upon is the clear dwindling of column inches dedicated to discussing the state in Leftist publications during both the 1980s and 1990s (it is unavoidable that there are far fewer articles discussed and referenced in sections iv., v. and vi. of this chapter compared to sections ii. and iii.). This feeds into the discussion regarding "particularization". As the Left moves closer towards accepting neoliberal discursive practices (the depoliticisation of the state and the elevation of liberal democracy as a historical certainty), it is natural to expect that articles discussing the state appear less and less. This is simply because the state is no longer up for discussion, it is not a talking point. The advent of liberal democracy in the early 1990s marks, in the words of Ximina Barros, 'a

victory' (March 9th, 1990: 10) and with that, the particular struggle for an end to autocratic rule in Chile has come to its natural resolution.

vii. Concluding remarks

This chapter marks the beginning of this research project's analysis of Leftist source material and is dedicated to analysing Leftist narratives around conceptualisations, understandings and analyses of the state. The chapter is divided into subsections which themselves followed a historiographical structure in order to track changes in said narratives. It is first noted in subsection ii that, prior to the 1973 coup, the Left, irrespective of political orientation and opinion towards the Allende government, universally applied a Marxist state analysis. The state is understood as a political entity that has two defining characteristics: firstly, the state is a construction of the bourgeoisie to promote and protect their interests, with the armed forces serving as a last gasp guarantee for the protection of Chile's capitalist orientation; secondly, the state embodies a power that can radically shape the Chilean social body and the subject. The conclusion is that, in the early 1970s, the Left conformed to a traditional orientation of the discourses of power as set out by the Lacanian-inspired ideology critiques upon which this thesis is founded, whereby the state espouses the discourse of the Master – the discourse of the all-powerful. This persists following the 1973 coup, and particular emphasis is placed on the political role of the armed forces as the coup was universally interpreted as a class solution to the growing influence of anti-capitalism in Chilean politics. It is surmised, therefore, that, in contrast to what is found in the analysis of *The Economist* in chapter four, the Left did not immediately submit to the neoliberal ideological procedure of discursive transference through depoliticising the state. The state instead continues to be understood as an innately political entity. It is concluded that this is because the Left in the United Kingdom was not yet subjected to the neoliberal counter-revolution in their own context and thus could observe other contexts (such as the Chilean one) in a manner free of neoliberal ideological influence.

It is at the beginning of the 1980s (subsection iv) that a change in Leftist state analysis is first noted. Some publications, such as *New Left Review* and *Militant* published articles that evidence a radical depoliticisation of the Chilean state, moving away from previously employed Marxist interpretations and towards an analysis not too dissimilar to those observed in *The Economist*. In these articles the state shifts from being that all powerful political actor constructed to serve certain class interests and towards an apolitical entity that is being misused by an autocratic leader (Pinochet). At the same time, the state's political capacity is reduced, going from an entity able to profoundly shape Chilean society to one that merely (mis)handles social crises. Here, the governmentality approach is invoked and provides the insights that, in depoliticising the state, the responsibility for the state's actions is lifted from the state and instead encumbered upon the subject themselves. It is the subject's responsibility to act in a manner that does not necessitate a suspension of democracy and abuses of human rights. This is mediated through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, demonstrating that this modification of subjectivity is a reflection of discursive transference: substituting the state's Mastery with the University discourse of neutrality and objectivity. Other publications, however, maintained their politicised state analysis so frequently employed in the 1970s, and one publication, *Socialist Challenge*, published articles that both maintained their Marxist state analysis and moved away from it.

This leads to the conclusion that, unlike the Right's active and enthusiastic embrace of neoliberal ideological tropes (seen in chapter four), the Left's submission to neoliberal ideology was a much more piecemeal and less uniform process. It was not until the 1990s that the Left's near-total submission to neoliberal ideological procedures was complete, as the few remaining Leftist publications that still existed at this time (many had by then ceased operating) evinced a complete acceptance of neoliberal discursive practices. The Left's coverage of the Chilean transition to democracy displayed a remarkable lack of analysis, as articles covering the resumption of liberal democracy resorted to merely describing the process with overt tones of exaltation and glee. This portrayal of liberal democracy as a universal certainty of the human condition is explained through the lens of the Žižek-Laclau debate and it is concluded that what is witnessed in these articles is the concurrent processes of over-particularisation and false-universalisation of the Chilean transition which demonstrates further submission to neoliberal ideological procedures. Furthermore, the governmentality approach provides further insights: the subjected is commanded to behave accordingly within the new neoliberal-democratic framework to prevent any retreat into autocracy. Further still, what is being seen is the continual process of discursive transference: the state's embodiment of the University.

The exceptions to this are *Socialist Worker* and *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* who still clung to their politicised interpretation of events in the 1990s. It is posited that the fact that the two organisations behind these papers (SWP and RCG) continue to operate today was worthy of consideration. This chapter suggests that it is no coincidence that those groups whose publications displayed a submission to neoliberal discursive practices had all ceased to exist by the end of the Cold War, whereas the SWP and RCG – whose publications seemed to resist such a submission – are still in existence. Again, read through the prism of Žižek-Laclau, in avoiding such an ideological 'about-turn' these groups have maintained their relevance in operating as anti-capitalist groups in the neoliberal era. This research therefore leaves open the possibility for further research into the demise of the British Left in the 1980s and early 1990s by encouraging any further research to take into consideration the importance of neoliberal ideological procedures that solidified in the United Kingdom at this time.

6. Jurisprudence, "rules of the game", and the law

i. Introduction

This chapter is the second that concerns the analysis of the principal source material of this thesis – articles from British far left publications that cover Chilean politics. Continuing with the process of dividing analysis chapters by topic rather than by chronology or by publication type, this chapter explores the evolving coverage of Chile by left-wing publications in the UK by focusing on the issue of the law and legal frameworks. It is unavoidable that this chapter overlaps at times with the previous one that covered the topic of the state (there is a natural confluence between the institutions of the state and the legal frameworks that constitute them), however, as is demonstrated throughout this chapter, the publications analysed in this project frequently discuss matters pertaining to law in direct terms. The fact that leftist publications were concerned with and highly attuned to legal matters in Chile comes as little surprise given that during the period under analysis (1970-1999) the country experienced four clearly identifiable landmark moments in its juridical history[18]: the suspension of democracy through extrajudicial means in 1973; the replacement of the constitution of 1925 with a new one drawn up by the junta in 1980; the democratic vote to remove Pinochet from office in 1988 and the subsequent transition to democracy; and, finally, the indictment of Pinochet in London and the legal wrangling that ensued between the two countries in 1998 and 1999. The material is interpreted through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis set out in chapter three, and this is mediated by a reading of events through existing jurisprudential approaches to neoliberalism (explored in chapter one).

This chapter, as with the previous analysis chapters, is structured according to chronology. This is not simply to maintain consistency between the analysis chapters but also makes sense in this instance given the landmark moments in Chile's legal history that are identified above. Sections ii and iii cover the analysis of source material from 1970-1971 and 1973-1974 respectively, broadly covering the entirety of the Allende administration, the coup that deposed it and the immediate aftermath. Section iv then covers the analysis of material drawn from 1979-1980 and 1984-1985 which is then followed by section v which deals with the material drawn from 1990-1991 and 1998-1999. The decision has been taken to aggregate the date ranges from the 1980s and 1990s into single sections covering each decade due to the dwindling amount material available from these time periods. This chapter finishes with some concluding remarks in section vi.

ii. 1970-1971: rudimentary Marxist legal theory entrenched within Leftist discourse

As noted in the previous chapter, the election of Allende sparked much interest amongst the British anti-capitalist Left in Chilean politics. It provided a clear test case to settle the well-established and fervent debate about socialist strategy: whether to create a socialist state by utilising the institutions of the liberal-bourgeois state apparatus; or to create a socialist state by insurrection. This was a continuous and unresolved debate on the British Left at the time and, as was previously noted in chapter five, the two schools of thought could be divided

[18] These were not the only legal changes in Chile during this period, however they are identified by this thesis as particularly important ones in order to add structure to the analysis.

between the CPGB on the one hand (favouring the "peaceful" or "democratic" road to socialism) and all other parties and organisations on the other. Articles that were published during the early years of the Allende administration predominantly focussed on this debate and thus on the nature of the capitalist state and, as such, fewer articles appeared in which the concept of the law was directly discussed. Nevertheless, some articles did emerge that discussed the law and socialist legal theory, though these discussions were couched in the broader debate on state. Those that did appear were predominantly written by voices critical of Allende and his UP government. Writing in *Militant*, Alan Woods stated that,

> 'A real Marxist leadership would have hammered home to the workers and peasants precisely the need to "go beyond" the artificial limitations imposed by a constitution drawn up by the ruling class in its own interest' (Woods October 1st, 1971: 2-3)

Woods is here reflecting upon the challenges that beset the Allende administration even in its earliest days that were set by a belligerent right-wing opposition backed by Richard Nixon's White House. In fact, even before Allende was officially inaugurated, the right-wing opposition attempted to utilise legal mechanisms set out by the constitution to restrict the scope of the presidential office once Allende was in La Moneda (Reyes 2011). The point he is making supports the stance taken by Militant (as an organisation) towards socialist strategy: that socialism cannot be achieved through liberal democratic means. This echoes the findings of the previous chapter, yet, what is key to note here is that Woods explicitly references the Chilean constitution in place at the time (which was instituted in 1925). Woods clearly believes that the impossibility of socialism via the peaceful road – the strategy in which Allende so dogmatically believed – is rooted in the legal framework (codified in the constitution) that structures Chile's democracy and its institutions. By extension, therefore, Woods believes that the entire Chilean legal structure is inherently geared towards protecting ruling class interests. This line of thinking is expressed by other Leftist organisations in their publications at the time. Earlier that year an article appeared in *Intercontinental Press* in which it was claimed that the UP was,

> 'An alliance that exercises power only within the framework of a bourgeois government and only on the condition that it maintain bourgeois order and respect both "personal human rights," that is, essentially, private property, and the honour of the army' (*Intercontinental Press* January 25th, 1971: 62)

This view that the capitalist state is upheld by a legal structure that is profoundly biased towards a section of society and its interests echoes very strongly rudimentary tenets of Marxist legal theory. Evgeny Pashukanis[19], one of the most celebrated and influential Marxist legal scholars of the early Soviet era, wrote in his authoritative *Law and Marxism,*

> 'One cannot question the fact that people experience law at a psychological level, especially when it figures as general norms or regulations of principle. However, it is

[19] Pashukanis is used here as an example of basic tenets of Marxist legal theory. It is important to recognise that Pashukanis himself was much maligned in the Soviet Union in the early 20th century and was executed under Stalin's rule in 1937. His ideas only became acceptable again to Soviet rulers after Stalin's death, and his ideas only gained traction outside of the USSR in the 1970s (Milovanovic 2003). Nonetheless, the key elements of his work that are cited in this chapter are intended to provide an insight into rudimentary Marxist approaches to jurisprudence, rather than to portray Pashukanis himself as the authoritative theorist that directly informed the analyses of the publications examined in this thesis.

> not a matter of affirming or denying the existence of the ideology (or psychology) of law, but rather of demonstrating that the categories of law have absolutely no significance other than an ideological one' (Pashukanis 1978: 73)

The clear adherence to Marxism by the British Left when analysing the nascent days of the Allende government resonates with the findings of the corresponding section to this one in the previous chapter. The Left, or at least the revolutionary Left (those groups who reject the 'peaceful' road to socialism), as evidenced by the two articles highlighted above, is dogmatic in its application of Marxist theory to Chilean politics, demonstrating an ability to penetrate the political and ideological structures that regulate power relations within society. However, it was not just the revolutionary Left that appears to have stuck to orthodox Marxism in this manner. In the same year, 1971, an article was published in the CPGB's theoretical journal *Marxism Today* which seemed to recognise the inherently political role played by legal structures:

> 'We must first make certain points quite clear: (1) The Popular Government will assure political liberty to the masses displaced from power, within the framework of respect for the present law and also of the new People's Law which will be established, so long as they show respect for that law. (2) Not all the opposition to the People's Government is legal; even before it began it found itself, and now finds itself, and will in the future find itself faced with *illegal oppositions* formed by the ultra-right and North-American imperialism' (Vuskovic July 1971: 202-203 [author's own italics])

There are two points to discuss here that are raised in this excerpt. Firstly, the mention of a 'People's Law' requires attention. At first glance, it appears as though the author does not recognise the political character of Chilean liberal democracy in the same manner as the authors of the *Militant* and *Intercontinental Press* pieces, insofar as he claims that 'political liberty' can be delivered to those 'displaced from power' by utilising existing legal procedures. This implies that the Chilean state is in fact not inherently partisan towards the ruling classes, as he sees it. However, in raising this idea of a 'People's Law' the author is intimating that Chilean liberal democracy as it stood then was not sufficient in delivering emancipation to the working classes, and that a new body of law is required to achieve this goal. The difference between Vuskovic and the authors of the *Militant* and *Intercontinental Press* articles is that the former believes that a new legal construction can work in conjunction with existing ones, whereas the latter believe that this new construction must replace existing frameworks. The commonality that binds the two sides of the British Left is that bourgeois democratic systems cannot and will not ever deliver socialism if left untouched.

The second point to discuss relating to the Vuskovic passage is that there is a recognition that the opposition to Allende is quite happy to break the law in order to achieve its goal (destabilising and ultimately removing Allende from office). It is unclear from the article what the author believes should be done to combat this, however the implication from the tone of the article is that the government should stick to applying the law to lawbreakers. There is no hint that the government should start taking extra-judicial measures. This stands in contrast to an article published a year later in *International Socialism*, the journal of the Socialist Workers Party (then the International Socialists):

> 'Events over the last year show that the class struggle in Chile has gone way beyond the limits of bourgeois legality…In all cases where the struggle has reached a stage that takes it beyond the sphere of the reformists' lawful "good manners", the government has intervened, not in order to strengthen the hand of workers in struggle, but to "arbitrate", to search for a compromise' (Rios 1972)

Again, this bone of contention for the Left over socialist strategy rears its head, this time in relation to the question to what extent the Left should observe and obey bourgeois legal constructs. This divide in the Left emerges much more strongly in 1973 as debates about the validity of bourgeois law sharpen.

iii. 1973-1974: the sharpening of orthodoxy and the deepening of divisions on the Left

In 1973 the climate of political crisis in Chile heightened, with opposition to the UP government strengthening both on the Right and the Left. Left opposition reflected an increasing frustration in some quarters that socialist reforms were not moving fast enough, particularly in the policy area of land reform, and dissident groups such as the MIR (*Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria* – Revolutionary Left Movement) began taking things into their own hands, bypassing government land redistribution efforts and seizing land themselves through occupations (Collier & Sater 2004). The Right, further aided by the US and wealthy members of the Chilean upper classes, became emboldened by their increasingly successful attempts to destabilise the government by orchestrating food shortages, strikes in key industries (such as the trucking industry) and street demonstrations (such as the infamous 'March of Pots and Pans' in which housewives from middle class suburbs in Santiago marched on the city to protest against rising food costs) (*ibid.*). By this time there was also a marked increase in anti-government terrorism from the Right, orchestrated predominantly by the neo-fascist group *Patria y Libertad* (PyL – Fatherland and Liberty), itself funded by the CIA (Blum 2004). Given the increasingly volatile and hostile political environment in Chile, coverage in British Leftist publications naturally increased at this time and exploded even more following the coup in September of 1973.

Considering the controversy over the questionable legality of certain opposition activities (such as the purposeful organisation of food shortages by industry bosses) and the unquestionable illegality of other activities (such as PyL's acts of sabotage and political assassinations), much of the British Left's coverage of Chile during this time centred around this concept of legality – specifically, to what extent the government should abide by the letter of the law when the opposition is quite happy to blur the lines between legal and illegal in some cases, and to completely ignore the law in others. As previously remarked, this question was raised even in the early days of the Allende administration, however it is in 1973 that the debate is dragged to the forefront of the British Left, and the division between the CPGB on the one hand and the rest of the British Marxist groups on the other becomes that much more apparent. Those groups that consistently called for the UP to adopt a more "revolutionary" or "insurrectionary" strategy were very vocal in their denunciation of the Allende government for strictly adhering to constitutional norms and observing the law despite the fact that the opposition was not: 'The right wing is confident now because it has been able to break the law repeatedly and suffer only minor reprisals, while Allende has stuck

to the letter of the law' (Roxborough and Richards May 19th 1973: 4). The International Socialists, in their newspaper *Socialist Worker*, apply a transparently Marxist reading of the situation. The group clearly understood legal structures in capitalist societies as being inherently biased towards the interests of the ruling classes. On the subject of food shortages and the emergence of a black market, one article in *Socialist Worker* claimed that, 'since most judges and lawyers belong to the class which benefits from the black market, prosecutions rarely take place unless actively pushed by the left' (June 2nd 1973: 4). This line of thinking was supported by other groups on the Left in the UK. Articles which appeared in 1973 prior to the coup, such as in *Intercontinental Press* and *Red Weekly* (newspaper of the IMG), frequently raised the fact that the UP's strict adherence to legality would be its downfall as Chilean legal frameworks, as with all legal frameworks in capitalist countries, are constructed to benefit the ruling classes (*Intercontinental Press* May 14th 1973: 560; *Red Weekly* August 17th 1973: 7). Again, what this demonstrates is a dogmatic adherence by the British Left to rudimentary Marxist theory and an ability to interpret the goings-on in Chile as part of the wider context of a global struggle against western capitalism and its imperialist backers (in this case, the United States).

A slightly different interpretation, however, is offered up by the CPGB. As has been frequently noted previously, the CPGB was at this point a party deeply committed to achieving socialism through the "parliamentary road". As such, the party had a vested interest in backing the UP and its belief in using existing institutions to achieve a socialist Chile. The analysis proffered by the party of the situation in Chile is less pointed than that offered by other British Marxist groups. Following the coup on the 11th of September, a flurry of articles appeared in the party's newspaper *Morning Star*, in which "the law" emerged as an important talking point. However, unlike other publications, the *Morning Star* articles strike a tone of sorrow rather than critique. One article laments the coup as being a 'revolt against a legally elected government recognised by the US' (September 14th 1973: 1), yet there is no discussion as to whether the UP's strategy was correct, nor is there any suggestion as to what the UP could have done differently to prevent the coup. The paper then published an intriguing article in which the author delves much deeper into the intricacies of both British and Chilean law than any other articles published in other Leftist publications. Reporting on Álvaro Bunster's (UP ambassador to the UK) discussions with the British Foreign Office following the coup, the *Morning Star* reported that,

> 'The Foreign Office will do nothing to intervene in the internal affairs of the Chilean embassy despite its illegal takeover by military junta representatives. Mr Bunster explained that the Foreign Office interpretation of article 22 of the Vienna Convention – which is incorporated in English law – was that an invasion of embassy could only be committed by persons from outside the embassy and not by its staff. The Foreign Office did not, therefore, see the internal junta takeover as an invasion, and would not evict those responsible' (September 18th, 1973: 1)

What is witnessed here is a remarkable willingness by the writers at the *Morning Star* to engage with intricate details of the English legal system and its relation to international law. Yet, these intricacies are discussed and framed without critique. The reporter is instead reporting the arguments of the government without going further, without deconstructing their validity. The fact that the *Morning Star* takes far more of an interest in legal arguments

and processes makes sense given the CPGB's desire to achieve socialism through institutional means, thereby gaining power through the very systems described in the article.

However, another publication of the CPGB, *Marxism Today*, takes a slightly different view of the situation, one that is more in keeping with the position adopted by the plethora of other Leftist groups in Britain at the time. John Hostettler, a former lawyer, legal historian and longtime member of the CPGB, provided a legal analysis of the coup and the junta's rule for *Marxism Today* in late 1973:

> 'Authoritarian measures as we have seen, assume form in the use of the State machine, through government, the army, the police, the law and the courts. Lord Devlin has recently put his mind to considering what he calls "Law in a Restless Society". He considers that the strength of law in a democratic society depends upon consensus and, if it is to work, must be a reflection of that consensus, must follow change in morals and customs. It is for politics and the legislature to incorporate the new not the courts and consequently law and order should be separated, not joined. Such a view ignores the class role of Law as an essential weapon in the armoury of the State…Northern Ireland shows – as the counter-revolution in Chile tragically illustrates – that the drive of the Right is capable of powerful and violent extension' (Hostettler December 1973: 362)

Hostettler recognises the inherently political role played by legal structures and the institutions of the law (such as courts, to which he refers). It would be too much of a leap to suggest that the different stances taken by the *Morning Star* and *Marxism Today* in these two articles indicate a rupture between the "activist" arm and "intellectual" arm of the party (though it is well documented that throughout its history the CPGB was often beset by internal schisms (Beckett 1995; Eaden & Renton 2002; Callaghan 2003)). What is certain, however, is that the party's stance on and interpretation of the law as a concept was not universal, and that there was at least some recognition within the party that laws play a political role in regulating societal relations.

The final theme that emerges from this tranche of source material is that of political repression and state violence which followed the coup. Naturally, this is intimately tied up with questions of legality and the non-adherence to the law by the Right in order to achieve its goals. Immediately there is recognition by the British Left that the junta's use of state violence (and thus rejection of legality) is part of a broader aim of fragmenting and weakening the workers' movement and the Left more generally:

> '[The repression] aims at the systematic destruction, the physical liquidation, of the organised Chilean workers' movement. But, and this has rarely been stressed before now, the repression goes beyond this: the policy of repression is not only aimed at the destruction of the organised workers' movement, but is directed against the entire working class' (Beauvais November 16th 1973: 5)

Red Weekly (in which the above article was published) is at the forefront of this analysis, promulgating the idea that the repression goes beyond defeating political opponents of the junta and is actually part of a broader aim at subjugating the working class further to capitalist

exploitation: 'This massive repression is an essential part of the junta's attempt to crush the working class and impose the maximum rate of exploitation' (Corby March 16th 1974: 8). Such an analysis is also expressed by the IMG-affiliated *Intercontinental Press* (October 8th 1973; Foley October 15th 1973; Beauvais February 18th 1974). Further to this analysis is the recognition that the junta must seek to "legalise" its activities in order to create credibility. This links back to the Pashukanis quote that, 'bourgeois philosophy…regards the legal relation as the eternal' (1978: 84). Corby, writing in *Red Weekly*, notes the junta's extensive use of military tribunals to try its opponents:

> 'For some time now the Chilean junta has been using military courts martial to try its political prisoners…The defendants are all charged with offences said to have been committed before the coup. The prosecution's argument is that the Allende government behaved unconstitutionally and was therefore "illegal". Consequently all those who supported it in any way can be accused of supporting an 'illegal' regime, passing national secrets to the "enemy", etc…A minor element in the trials has been the junta's attempt to demonstrate that it goes through 'normal' judicial procedures' (Corby June 13th 1974: 7)

As Gerry Hedley wrote in *Red Weekly* a few months later, 'the deaths in the concentration camps, the bullet in the back of the head, have to be "legalised"' (Hedley September 12th 1974: 5). This demonstrates once again the Left's continued reading of the law as a tool utilised by the bourgeoisie, rather than as an objective structure to be obeyed by all.

In summation, the coverage by the British Left of early 1970s Chilean politics, up to and including the coup and its immediate aftermath, demonstrates firstly the continued application of Marxist theory to the entirety of the Chilean experience. When discussing matters pertaining to the law, the varied publications of the Left routinely proffer analyses that chime with Marxist legal theory, such as that developed by Pashukanis, namely that legal structures are ideological constructs that serve as a tool to bolster the position of the ruling classes. The second side to this coverage is that the Chilean Right's breaking of the law, and particularly it's propensity to use extrajudicial violence is to be read in the wider context of the constant struggle of the working classes against the agents of western capitalism and imperialism. As is evidenced in the proceeding sections, this analysis that is near-universal on the British Left, begins to wane in the 1980s. This is in keeping with what is found in chapter five, namely that as neoliberalism "comes home" (is implemented by the Thatcher government from 1979 onwards), the British Left exhibits a softening of its Marxist dogma and gradually subsumes to neoliberal ideological tropes.

iv. The 1980s: Marxist orthodoxy wanes; the 'rule of law' as *grundnorm* and the Left's acquiescence to neoliberal new constitutionalism

The major "legal" moment in Chile during the 1980s was the drawing up, ratification (by way of a popular plebiscite) and enacting of Pinochet's new constitution in 1980 which replaced the existing one of 1925. As is explained in the previous chapter, the 1980 constitution was not just a legal manoeuvre to legitimise the junta's rule, but it was also designed to entrench within Chile a neoliberal reorientation of the economy and body politic. Indeed, the constitution has been referred to as the 'Constitution of Liberty', a "hat tip" to Friedrich Hayek

who published a book under the same name (Ensalaco 1999: 179; Barros 2002: 255). What is interesting is that it appears as though certain Leftist groups in the UK were wise to this deeper significance of the constitution, ably perceiving the link between the reorientation of Chile's politico-legal structure and the reorientation of Chilean capitalism. An article in *Militant* that was published in July 1979 positions the new constitution as part of a package of wider legal reforms that are to entrench Chile's new neoliberal configuration:

> 'The junta is not about to topple, but it can no longer rule in the old way. In an attempt to maintain its position, it is now introducing new reactionary legislation. An amnesty law which will be used to pardon amongst others the killers of Orlando Letelier (a member of Allende's government). An anti-terrorist law. A labour plan whereby the junta will try to control the unions as it can no longer outlaw them. Laws to dismantle the National Health Service. A new constitution to be published and 'voted on' later this year' (July 13th, 1979: 11)

As another article in *Militant* asserted in the following year, 'the new constitution proposals were drawn up by a government commission, in an attempt to dampen down criticism of the military's rule. They want to establish a capitalist dictatorship on a sure footing' (July 25th, 1980: 10). This is a clear indication of a continuation of interpreting legal frameworks as having a key structuring role in organising and sustaining bourgeois domination in capitalist societies and is thus in keeping with the Marxist interpretation of the law as stipulated above. By contrast, there is a continuation of the CPGB's de-politicised reporting of events and legal arguments, indicating that the party continued in its analysis of Chile's changing legal framework by looking at events purely as exercises in law, with little consideration to the wider dynamic at play:

> 'In one month's time the junta decree number 3465 will institute the new constitution. As Raul Caro, communications worker and a member of the external committee of the Chilean TUC in Britain to lobby the British TUC, declared this week, "it institutionalises the devaluation of human rights in Chile. The constitution itself", he said, "is a violation of international rights agreed by the United Nations"' (Whitfield September 11th, 1980: 2)

It was noted earlier that despite the CPGB's preponderance to focus on legal intricacies in its analysis, there were at times discussions of the wider significance of permutations in Chile's legal system in the reportage. By the onset of the 1980s, however, all semblance of any application of Marxist legal theory has disappeared. Furthermore, the *Morning Star's* reportage narrows even further the scope of its analysis when it comes to developments in Chilean law by focusing almost solely on the issue of human rights and the lack of protection for them:

> 'Sharp condemnation of the proposal of the British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington to hold talks with the foreign secretary of Chilean dictator Pinochet has been expressed by the political committee of the Communist Party… The British labour and progressive movement, ever since the 1973 coup, has demonstrated its opposition to the fascist junta and its solidarity with the people of Chile who are struggling so heroically to win back their democratic rights… No steps to restore Chile should be

> taken until human, trade union and democratic rights are restored in Chile; until the whereabouts of all the disappeared prisoners is explained; and until those responsible for torture and assassination are brought to trial' (September 1st, 1979: 2)

The excerpt above, from an article published a year prior to the first article cited, indicates a clear narrowing of analysis. Notions of capitalism and imperialism are conspicuous in their absence. The reductive language of 'fascist junta' stands markedly in contrast to articles published in other publications in which the junta is located within a wider network of repressive capitalist state structures sympathetic to bourgeois interests and backed by western imperialist powers (namely the US and the UK). Instead, the analysis is confined to "human rights", which indicates a reading of the Chilean experience as a national struggle for legal protections for citizens rather than as part of an international anti-capitalist struggle. The dialing in on human rights as the main issue for discussion here also reflects a process of particularisation, as outlined by Žižek (see chapter three for detailed discussion). Chile is no longer seen as one battleground that is part of the wider struggle against capitalism and imperialism, but instead is seen as a human rights struggle to be approached specifically as a case particular to the Chilean experience. While the *Morning Star* is the first publication to exhibit such a tendency, what is shown in the rest of this chapter is that it was not the only publication that conformed to this manner of analysis. This point is revisited and continued in section v, when it is uncovered that by the 1990s the remnants of the British Left had also conformed to this neoliberal ideological trope of particularisation.

The narrowing of analysis was not confined to the CPGB in the 1980s. The trend is noticeable in the publications of other Leftist parties, albeit the constricting of their analyses did not home in on human rights like the *Morning Star,* at least not in the 1980s. Lars Palmgren, writing in *Intercontinental Press*, remarked on the plebiscite held to ratify the new constitution,

> 'The whole thing was indeed a farce: One could only vote "yes" or "no" on a package of measures that included an authoritarian new constitution that will not go into effect until the late 1990s and an extension of Pinochet's term in office for at least eight and possible as much as sixteen years' (Palmgren October 20th 1980: 1072)

Again, reductive language is used here as the author refers to the constitution as 'authoritarian', serving only to extend Pinochet's term in office. There is no discussion of the wider significance of the constitution or its aims beyond that of shoring up Pinochet's control over the country. The general tone of the article is one of contempt as the author impresses that it is farcical that the vote's legitimacy was undermined by questions over the impartiality of electoral officials. Overall, the article alludes to a subtle yet nonetheless staggering change in interpretation of the law and legality by the publication. In focusing specifically on the voting process, the author insinuates that it is the manner in which the plebiscite was held that was the contentious issue in 1980, rather than the basis of the constitution itself. Of course, it would be remiss to suggest that questions of impropriety around polling day are not important or worthy of discussion, however, by focussing explicitly on this issue while failing to engage with the content or significance of the constitution itself denotes a significant transformation in the publication's understanding of these issues.

In order to fully appreciate and understand the importance of what *Intercontinental Press* is doing here, existing jurisprudential approaches to neoliberalism need introducing at this point. Specifically, Kelsen's *grundnorm* theory is particularly instructive. As was explored in chapter one, the premise of Kelsen's work is that in order for political structures to hold universal legitimacy within society they must be founded upon a legal framework whose integrity and basis is unquestioned (Kelsen 2008). May (2014) builds on this and ascertains that neoliberalism is a project grounded in the premise that the legal frameworks that constitute it are articulated as indisputable, leading the author to associate neoliberalism with an altogether new approach to jurisprudence. Gill (1998) shares this perspective, which he terms 'new constitutionalism'. What Palmgren's article cited above demonstrates is an implicit acceptance of the *grundnorm* that sustains Chile's neoliberalism. If legal frameworks such as constitutions are simply "rules of the game", by focussing on the voting procedures during the plebiscite, Palmgren is confining his analysis to the (mis)application of, and (non)adherence to, these "rules of the game", rather than the content of the 'rules' themselves. This is also evident in the analysis proffered in the *Morning Star* articles. May (2014) asserts that the *grundnorm* of neoliberalism, the 'basic norm' that makes neoliberal legal and political structures legitimate, is the idea of the 'rule of law'. What's more, the rule of law as *grundnorm* always follows an 'initial (original) moment of force, or assertion of legitimate authority' (May 2014: 66). That moment of force' can be identified in Chile as being the 1973 coup and the ensuing political repression by the state. It was discussed in chapter four how, even before the coup, the groundwork for the coup's legitimation and justification was laid by the Right both within and outwith Chile by portraying the Allende regime and its Leftist supporters as behaving unconstitutionally. The junta carried this baton forward by justifying its violent repression as combatting terrorism. The constitution was therefore justified by the junta as being necessary to restoring peace in Chile (Barros 2002). In a *Militant* article that was published in 1985, author Paul Hannick writes,

> 'In Chile, the Communist Party and the other parties of the working class have adopted the call for a 'popular insurrection', reflecting the sentiment amongst wide layers of workers. However, unfortunately, the CP leaders have distorted this sentiment to give credence to the methods of individual terrorism' (Hannick September 6th, 1985: 9)

The use of the term 'terrorism' is stridently symbolic. Given the date of the article's publication it is clear the author is referring to the ever-rising number of political assassinations carried out by members of various left-wing groups in Chile. These groups, which included the PCCh, had been outlawed by the 1980 constitution (the constitution prohibited any political group that espoused revolutionary politics, meaning all Marxist parties were banned). This led to a major rift in the Chilean opposition as the constitution forced leftist organisations to either abandon their pretensions to more radical politics and join the legally recognised opposition that was led by the PDC (a party that played a significant role in laying the groundwork for the 1973 coup), or to continue to adhere to their political programmes and be driven into clandestinity by the junta. The PS, in a striking political about-turn, abandoned its Marxist ideology and joined the PDC to form the *Alianza Democrática* (Democratic Alliance) in 1983 (Loveman Winter 1986-1987). The PCCh and other smaller left-wing groups, such as the MIR, refused (Muñoz 2008). In his lamentation of the PCCh's continued use of political violence against the junta, or 'terrorism' as he puts it, Hannick evidences an implied acceptance of the *grundnorm* that underlies the 1980 constitution as he

echoes the narratives pushed forward by the original justifying voices of the coup in the 1970s. It is not clear here whether the author rejects all forms of political violence outright, or whether it is simply individual acts (rather than collective) that is to be deplored, but the fact that no distinction or clarification is made indicates the former. Furthermore, the choice of the word 'terrorism' is a further indication of this given the negative connotations associated with this term.

The insights of the jurisprudential approach can also be mediated through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis developed throughout this thesis. A broader understanding can be reached as to how the change in analysis by some on the British Left of Chilean legal matters demonstrates a further subjugation by the Left to neoliberal ideology. By positioning the Chilean legal framework as the *grundnorm*, those legal institutions, and the constitution upon which they are founded, are articulated as the objective body that justifies Chile's neoliberal orientation. The denunciation of illegal activities by the likes of Hannick implies a further act of discursive transference. The new legal framework instituted by the 1980 constitution acts as the discourse of the University, objectively justifying Chile's neoliberal reoformulation, as if it were an indisputable natural law. As evidenced in the previous chapter on "the state", this Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis serves as a unifying thread, along which seemingly disparate processes of governmentality (explored in chapter five) and new constitutionalism (explored here) have a common theme: the depoliticisation of structuring discourse that is fundamental to neoliberal ideology. This process has very clear material effects (seen here as effects on legal structures) and effects on subjectivity (exposed in the previous chapter). As is demonstrated in the following section, this process is heightened in the 1990s as neoliberalism becomes entrenched as the dominant ideological order in both the UK and in Chile. This manifests in the British Left's coverage of two of the most important events in Chile's recent legal history: the completion of the transition to democracy in 1990 and the indictment of Pinochet and his arrest in London in 1998.

v. The 1990s: *Grundnorm* is fully established as 'ethics' replaces Marxism

With the inauguration of Patricio Aylwin as President of Chile in 1990, Chile's transition to formal democracy was completed[20]. The analysis of the British Left's coverage of this event was extensive in chapter five, as the issue of Leftist interpretations of the state was prominent around this time, given Chile's transition from an authoritarian state to a formally democratic one. As such, the analysis of state interpretations and the analysis of interpretations of the law (specifically constitutional law) overlap significantly with one another. While it is important not to simply repeat and regurgitate *ad nauseam* that which was written and analysed in the previous chapter, it is nonetheless important to reassert important themes that emerged in chapter five so as the highlight their importance to this chapter's analysis. It was noted above that despite *Militant*'s longstanding efforts to interpret Chile's legal framework, and specifically the implementation of the 1980 constitution, in a Marxist perspective (that legal structures in capitalist societies act as a tool for bourgeois interests), this form of analysis began to waver in the 1980s (particularly evident in the article published

[20] Some academics contend that the transition to democracy was not fully completed until the 2000s, by which point certain aspects of the 1980 constitution had been reformed (Barton and Murray 2000; Bresnahan 2003). However, following the beginning of Aylwin's term as President in 1990, the transition is identified here by this thesis as ending at the "formal" level, that being the successful completion of free and fair national popular elections, which were held in 1989.

in 1985). In chapter five, an article that appeared in *Militant* on the 9th of March 1990 (written by Ximina Barros) was cited as evidence of the publication submitting to neoliberal ideology, for it contained no attempt to locate the newly democratic Chile within a wider network of formally-democratic anti-worker, pro-bourgeois capitalist states that were emerging following the break-up of the Soviet Union and other Communist states. The article also hailed the democratic transition as a 'massive victory for the workers and youth' (Barros March 9th 1990: 10), without analysing the restrictive terms placed upon the transition process by the 1980 constitution or the lack of civil society groups' involvement (such as trade unions, indigenous groups and others) in the transition process (the transition has been identified as taking place purely at an "elite level" (Nef 2003)). *Militant*'s narrow analysis of Chile's nascent democracy was interpreted in the previous chapter as evincing a depoliticisation of the state – a key trope of neoliberal ideology – and this was established through a Lacanian-inspired interpretation, reading *Militant* as actively stripping the state of its autonomous mastery (the discourse of the Master) and substituting it with the discourse of the University, the discourse of objectivity and truth (liberal democracy is now seen as the "right" way of organising and brokering power relations within society). This analysis can now be bolstered here by considering *Militant's* changing interpretation of "the law" as well as "the state". In the very same article, Barros writes,

> 'Pinochet's constitution is still in force. Any party that calls itself Marxist, anything that creates "instability" – for example, to call for a general strike – is still illegal…Under the constitution Pinochet has nominated nine members of the senate (upper house), giving them [the Right] a majority even though they lost the elections. Obviously that can be used to block reforms' (Barros March 9th 1990: 10)

Taken at face value, it seems as though the author is aware of the explicitly biased, anti-Left basis of the 1980 constitution. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that the recognition that 'Pinochet's constitution is still in force' occurs in a vacuum. That is to say, this recognition is not linked to the broader goal of the constitution of entrenching neoliberalism within Chile's liberal democracy and protecting ruling class interests. The constitution is instead seen as having the simple effect of restricting collective action rights (such as strike action, to which the author refers) and stacking the upper house of the Chilean legislature in the favour of right-wing parties. These measures are there simply to 'block reforms', as the author states, meaning that the author of the article interprets the 1980 constitution as simply being a tool to benefit Pinochet and his allies rather than to entrench neoliberalism further. That analytic leap is not made by this article, and this is important. It was surmised in the previous section of this chapter that the self-enforced restricting of legal analysis by the Left to simply the "rules of the game" – thereby jettisoning rudimentary Marxist legal theory which the Left appeared to embrace near-universally in the 1970s – attested to an implicit acceptance of the neoliberal basis of Chile's new (post-1980) legal structure. In Kelsen's language, it attested to the concurrent establishment and embrace of the post-1980 *grundnorm*. Through a Lacanian-inspired lens, it attests to the ongoing process of imbuing state institutions with the discourse of the University. By focussing solely on the restrictions, the constitution places on Chile's legislature through the electoral system, *Militant* once again exhibits a submission to neoliberal ideological tropes.

This acceptance by the Left of legal structures as simply the "rules of the game" is resolutely confirmed by the late 1990s, specifically during the legal wrangling that ensued between the UK, Spain and Chile following Pinochet's indictment by Spanish magistrate Baltasar Garzón for human rights abuses on the 10th of October 1998, and his arrest in London six days later. Pinochet was held under house arrest by the UK government for around a year and half while prosecutors attempted to litigate their way through the English legal system[21] in order to have him extradited to Spain to face charges. Ultimately, Jack Straw MP, then Home Secretary, ruled in January 2000 that Pinochet would not be extradited on grounds of ill health and he was subsequently released, whereby he travelled back to Chile as a free man (Evans 2006). The case, which spanned nearly two years engulfed the UK in a story that brought frictions between domestic and international law, and between human rights law and diplomatic immunity protections to the forefront of national debate in the UK, and the British Left was not immune to this, with the story receiving large amounts of coverage in the now diminished (in terms of number of publications, readership and influence) radical press. The paper that covered the story the most was the *Morning Star*, unsurprising as it was one of the few left-wing papers still in circulation at the time and was the only socialist daily. The paper, in keeping with its form of legal analysis from previous years, took a narrow, legalistic approach to its coverage:

> 'If the Spanish extradition bid fails, Britain would be able to arrest General Pinochet under Section 134 of the 1988 Criminal Justice Act, which provides powers to deal with those suspected of torture anywhere in the world' **(**Ambrose and Kasrils October 19th, 1998: 1)

The above excerpt, from a front-page article titled 'Pinochet must face the music', reads like a quote from a case brief rather than an article from a political publication. The article treats English law as an entity of inescapable objectivity. There is not even a mention of the fact that the piece of legislation to which it refers was passed by the Thatcher government, one of the closest allies to Pinochet and his regime. Following Pinochet's initial success in preventing his extradition in October 1998, the paper acknowledged that 'legal procedure had to be followed', while expressing hope that the House of Lords (at that time the highest court in the English legal system) would overrule the High Court's ruling that Pinochet enjoyed immunity as a former head of state (Kasrils and Denny October 31st 1998: 1). This article demonstrates further observation of legal structures as objective entities. In early 1999 the House of Lords did as the paper wished and overturned the High Court ruling, though it added that Pinochet could not face charges for crimes committed before 1988 (the year the Criminal Justice Act was passed). The *Morning Star* again observed the letter of the law as unquestionable fact:

> 'The Law Lords ruled yesterday that General Pinochet must remain in Britain to face extradition to Spain on murder charges…But the Law Lords also ruled that General Pinochet could not be prosecuted for tortures committed in Chile before September 1988, when Britain passed the Criminal Justice Act, which made torture an extraditable offence' (Ambrose March 25th, 1999: 6)

[21] It is important to emphasise the use of the word 'English' rather than 'British' here as the UK has no unitary legal system. The Pinochet extradition case was heard and fought through the English system.

Having already failed previously to pass critical comment on the Criminal Justice Act, the paper fails to do so again. The tone of the article, perceptible in the passage cited above, is one of reluctant acceptance, again attesting to the *Morning Star's* interpretation of the law as something to be observed rather than to be critiqued. However, it is not just the *Morning Star* that strikes this conciliatory tone towards English law. The Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG) also adopts this stance in its paper *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!.* The paper published an article in which it criticised at length the original High Court ruling and supported the subsequent House of Lords judgement:

> 'The original High Court judgement, which ruled that Pinochet had immunity for acts he committed as head of state, flew in the face of international law as it has developed since the Second World War. Lord Bingham in passing judgement, stated that nothing invalidated the principle "that one sovereign state will not impede another in relation to its sovereign acts…The applicant is entitled to immunity as a former sovereign from the criminal and civil process of the English court." In other words, all acts of a sovereign or head of state are 'official acts' and therefore covered by immunity…However, the judgement ignored the Nuremberg principle, that "immunity did not apply to acts condemned as criminal by international law." Pinochet would have immunity for acts undertaken whilst exercising the functions of a head of state. But international conventions, now part of English law, do not recognise kidnapping, torture or murder as functions or "official acts" of a head of state. The three Law Lords who ruled against Pinochet were doing no more than upholding international law as it currently stands, which overrides the doctrine of immunity for such acts' (Clough December 1998/January 1999)

Once again, this article reads as if it were a case brief rather than a piece of analysis from the newspaper of a Marxist political group. There are two things to take away from the above passage. Firstly, the fact that the RCG is following the form of coverage shared by the *Morning Star* is important. Throughout this chapter it has been demonstrated that even since the 1970s, the paper of the CPGB has often interpreted matters of the law in strictly legal terms. Though in the 1970s this analysis was occasionally combined with a broader "political" interpretation of the law, this line of thinking within the CPGB conformed to the party's longstanding political strategy of utilising liberal democratic institutions to achieve socialism. As the law is one such institution, it is unsurprising that the party and its publications were keen to promote the law as having the ability to suit socialist aims. However, the RCG has never embraced the "democratic" road to socialism espoused by the CPGB. Given this, the adherence to the view that the law is something to be passively observed rather than actively critiqued somewhat contradicts of the group's political strategy of achieving socialism through insurrection and popular revolution[22]. It was suggested in chapter five that one plausible explanation for the RCG's continued existence (in contrast to the litany of other radical left-wing groups in the UK that folded around the end of the Cold War) was because the group has managed to withstand neoliberal ideological tropes. This conclusion was reached through the analysis of *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* articles in which the state is continued to be interpreted by the group as being an inherently political construction (read through the Lacanian-inspired lens as still embodying the discourse of the Master). It appears

[22] As is indeed stated on their website (*Fight Racism! Fight Fascism!* September 19th, 2012)

here, however, that this may not be the case. When it comes to the concept of the law, the group observes it not as a political construct but as an objective entity deserving of obedient observation.

The second issue that is thrown up by these cited articles is inherently tied to this idea of the state as embodying a certain Mastery. Neither the *Morning Star* nor the *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* articles recognise one of the most curious aspects of the British political system at this time: the lack of separation between the judiciary, the legislature and the executive. It is noted quite plainly by both publications that the House of Lords, the second chamber of the Houses of Parliament (the UK's legislature) is (or at least, was at the time) the highest court in the English legal system. At no point do either publication make the connection between the political position and the legal position of the House of Lords. On the one hand, this further strengthens the conclusion of chapter four that the *Morning Star* has ceded to neoliberal ideology in depoliticising the state, and on the other further brings into question the validity of the conclusion that *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* (and thus by extension the RCG) has not. This means that this preliminary conclusion offered in chapter five merits reconsidering. It was noted in the previous chapter that when discussing the Chilean transition to democracy, *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!* viewed the new liberal democratic Chilean state as a 'facade of democracy' (Clough August/September 1998), implying that the author viewed the Chilean state as still being an inherently political construction (formal democracy is not being read by the RCG as the "right way" or "only way" of doing politics, in contrast to other publications at the time). Whereas here, when discussing the Pinochet case, the British state's legal foundations escape such an analysis. This means that a more complex and nuanced conclusion needs to be formulated: when analysing foreign states the RCG appears confident in its political convictions, analysing them as political structures constructed to benefit a certain section of society (the ruling class), whereas when discussing British issues, the state is instead viewed as an impartial authority. This suggests that the RCG's analysis of the state is much more clouded by neoliberal ideology when considering matters closer to home, meaning that while the group may not have submitted to neoliberal ideology completely, it has partially[23].

Another theme that emerges from the source material of the 1990s is that of human rights. Not only was the Pinochet indictment and arrest case intimately bound up in national and international legal protections of human rights, but human rights were also a focus for the Left following the Chilean government's establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation commission, a commission to reveal the extent of human rights abuses under the junta and, where appropriate, to prosecute perpetrators of such acts. The commission was established in 1990 and its report was published a year later. Both the commission and the Pinochet indictment fitted in to a broader context of human rights becoming a major political discussion point in both the UK and Chile in the 1990s. The importance of human rights to the zeitgeist of the 1990s is evident in the publications of the Left. Reflecting on the Chilean experience since 1973, Manuel Riesco wrote in *New Left Review*, 'Chilean society seems to be

[23] As in the previous chapter, it is important to recognise that the conclusions reached regarding the RCG are derived from one article, as the availability of relevant sources during this timeframe is very limited. This means that said conclusions cannot be stated with absolute certainty and would benefit from a wider analysis of similar source material. This is reflected upon in the concluding chapter of this thesis. Nevertheless, given what is thrown up by the article in question, such conclusions are still worth pondering.

finally confronting the imperative of expressing at least a degree of the truth and justice it has been lacking over human rights issues, so as to rebuild its fabric in an ethically sound way' (1999: 98). This quote has been selected here for one important reason: its reference to ethics. To understand why this is important, a return to the work of Kelsen is needed. In *Pure Theory of Law,* Kelsen devotes significant space in his book to the question of morals and ethics and their relation to the law. For Kelsen, there is a clear and direct link between the *grundnorm* that underpins a legal framework, the law itself and societal norms, to which he refers as 'morals':

> 'In addition to legal norms, there are other norms regulating the behaviour of men to each other, that is, social norms…These social norms may be called "morals," and the discipline directed toward their cognition and description, "ethics." So far as justice is a postulate of morals, the relationship between justice and law is included in the relationship between morals and law' (Kelsen 2008: 59)

In other words, legal systems – and by extension the *grundnorm* upon which they are founded – are bound up in commonly accepted morals, described collectively as 'ethics.' By referring explicitly to the ethical implications of such processes as the Truth and Reconciliation commission, Riesco is implicitly accepting the moral authority that is part and parcel of the legal process of the commission. This is significant as the commission's purview was tightly confined by the 1980 constitution, as the constitution provided an amnesty for any and all human rights abuses that may have occurred prior to its ratification. Ergo, this is another acceptance of the *grundnorm* that anchors Pinochet's constitutional framework. Read once more alongside this thesis' Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, this understanding and role of ethics is given an incontestable centrality to the entire process, and is perfectly accepted and observed by Riesco, evidencing further the process of discursive transference. *New Left Review* is not the only publication that highlights the importance of ethics when it comes to dealing with issues pertaining to human rights:

> 'The decision to arrest General Pinochet late on Friday night reflected the Labour government's switch to an ethical foreign policy, following the years in which the Thatcher government boosted the repressive regime' (Ambrose and Kasrils October 19th, 1998: 1)

> 'Communist Party of Britain general secretary Robert Griffiths said: "We welcome any attempt to call General Pinochet to account for the crimes and atrocities committed during his reign of bloody dictatorship. The arrest should mark the beginning of a truly ethical foreign policy from Britain's Labour government, whereby no aid or support is given to tyrannical regimes elsewhere in the world"' (Denny and Ambrose October 20th, 1998: 6)

Both *Morning Star* articles here refer to British foreign policy rather than domestic Chilean affairs, however the references to "ethics" are nonetheless important. The authors' decision to laud both the Labour government's foreign policy and its supposedly "ethical" foundations marks a remarkable jettisoning of archetypal radical Leftist analyses of British foreign policy: that British foreign policy has long been formulated around imperialist and capitalist objectives. The articles appear to support the purportedly "humanitarian" basis of Blair's

foreign policy agenda, a basis that has been accredited as justifying the interventions in Kosovo at around the same time that these articles were published (Wheeler & Dunne 1998; Phythian 2007). All in all, what this indicates is a noteworthy move towards embracing one of the cornerstones of the "Third Way" – that term for a neoliberal orientation of the centre-left which developed in many Western European nations in the late 1980s and 1990s (Hale et al. 2004). The invocation of 'ethics' in these texts echoes the theoretical bases of the "Third Way", specifically the work of Anthony Giddens. Giddens advocated a "Third Way" position by conceptualising socialism as an ethical doctrine rather than a programmatic one. In other words, socialism is not defined by specific policies (such as widespread nationalisation), strategy (such as revolution) or even critical theoretical considerations (anti-capitalism) but is instead defined by an ethical consideration that society should be more "just" (Giddens 1994). Indeed, by explicitly referencing a 'truly ethical foreign policy', the *Morning Star* is parroting a New Labour buzzword that was frequently deployed at the time (*The Guardian* May 12th 1997). The articles cited above therefore reflect the wider phenomenon of the reconstruction of the Left in the West around the time of the end of the Cold War. The invocation of 'ethics' when considering legal issues, such as the prosecution of human rights abusers, can therefore be understood as another indication that the radical Left in the UK (here represented by the formerly CPGB-aligned *Morning Star* and the non-aligned *New Left Review*) has submitted to neoliberal ideological tropes by the 1990s.

The final consideration to made here before concluding this chapter is on the broad particularisation of the human rights issue by the vestiges of the British Left in the 1990s. It was noted in section iv. of this chapter that the CPGB's newspaper the *Morning Star* began to exhibit the process of particularisation as was set out by Žižek in his debate with Ernesto Laclau. Through an analysis of two *Morning Star* articles from 1979 and 1980 it was demonstrated that the CPGB had isolated the issue of human rights as the issue that defined the Chilean experience under Pinochet and thus it was deduced that this serves as a key indicator of the publication's subjugation to neoliberal ideology (particularisation having been identified as a neoliberal ideological trope in previous chapters). The articles discussed in this section, which were published at the end of the 1990s, also serve to strengthen this conclusion, as the newspaper has demonstrated a continual particularisation of human rights by placing it at the centre of its coverage of different issues relating to Chile (in the 1980s it was the ratification of Pinochet's constitution, in the 1990s it was Pinochet's extradition case). This can also be seen in the *New Left Review article* cited earlier in this section, indicating that it is not just the *Morning Star* that has subjugated to neoliberal ideology. However, one organisation, the SWP (formerly IS) appears to buck this trend, and this is evidenced in articles published in both its theoretical journal, *International Socialism,* and its newspaper, *Socialist Worker.* In 1988[24] *International Socialism* published an article titled 'Nightmares of the Market: Chile, Yugoslavia and Hungary' (Haynes 1988). The title immediately gives the scope of the author's analysis. The article positions Chile within a wider system in which radical free market capitalism – neoliberalism – has been forced upon various developing nations since the 1970s. The author makes a direct link between the Chilean junta's human rights abuses and the form of capitalism to which the country was subjected:

[24] Various date ranges were given at the outset of this thesis that would place direction upon the source analysis. 1988 does not fall within the date ranges specified, however given the limited amount of source material available from the late 1980s onwards (unsurprising considering the fact that many of the groups behind the publications studied had folded around this time), some material has been sought outside of the prescribed dates.

> 'The repression even displaced the remnants of the old liberal section of the Chilean ruling class from power. The result was that Pinochet and his supporters created sufficient room to implement an extreme market solution unknown in the rest of the world' (*ibid.*: 13)

A direct association is made between the violence of the state and the neoliberal turn. The author adeptly perceives the near destruction of organised labour and its political bodies (the trade unions and the Leftist parties) as not just an abuse of civil liberties but as a calculated manoeuvre to reorient Chilean civil society. This article reads like the type that was commonplace in various Leftist publications in the 1970s and it is clear that the author is keen to maintain a more overt Marxist interpretation of the Chilean experience and of the human rights issue. From this article it appears that the SWP had managed in the late 1980s to resist the subjugation to neoliberal ideology and, what's more, this does not appear to change in the 1990s. On the 5th of December 1998, *Socialist Worker* dedicated a front-page article and a two-page centrefold spread to covering the Pinochet extradition case and to revisiting the Allende government and its overthrow in 1973. Throughout the paper links are made between human rights abuses, capitalism and imperialism, with the quotation below serving as a perfect example of this:

> 'Pinochet's coup was a disaster for Chile's workers. The immediate and savage repression was followed by a major assault on workers' living standards. Pinochet became the darling of free market politicians as he embraced the "monetarist" doctrines backed by politicians like Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan' (December 5th, 1998: 9)

Here there is a direct connection made between state violence ('savage repression'), capitalism ('major assault on workers' living standards'), neoliberal doctrine ('"monetarist" doctrines') and imperialism ('Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan'). Such connections have been absent from the bulk of the British Left's political discourse – as expressed in the publications analysed in this thesis – since the 1980s, with such analysis waning from the late 1970s onwards. This was also noted in chapter five and the conclusion offered by this thesis has been that this change in analysis, and the timeline this change follows, reflects the Left's gradual submission to neoliberal ideology as the Left battles and fails to defeat the neoliberal government of Margaret Thatcher (who herself came to office in 1979, around the time the Left's analysis of Chile begins to change). The exceptions to this rule were recognised in chapter five as being the SWP and the RCG. Already in this chapter the conclusion about the RCG has had to be revised in light of what has been discussed here. However, the conclusion about the SWP appears to still hold true and this is evidenced by the two articles discussed above.

vi. Concluding remarks

This chapter is the second of those which is concerned with the analysis of the primary source material of this thesis, that being articles published in British Leftist newspapers and journals and is dedicated to analysing said material in relation to the second of the three themes that were drawn from chapter one: 'the law'. As such, this chapter's focus is how the British Left

conceptualised, understood and interpreted permutations in Chile's legal structure, and how that may have changed between 1970 and 1999. In order to track said changes this chapter is divided into chronological subsections, in-keeping with the format of the two previous analysis chapters. It is first noted in subsection ii. that, from the outset of Allende's administration, the groups of the British Left expressed, through their varied publications, a legal analysis that was in keeping with Marxist legal theory. Parallels can be drawn between the form of analysis offered by the Left and the insights of soviet legal theorists (such as Evgeny Pashukanis, whose work is offered by this chapter as an example of Marxist legal theory), whereby the legal structures and frameworks that constitute and uphold the institutions of a capitalist state (as early 1970s Chile was seen by the Left) are understood as being inherently biased and constructed with the specific goal of maintaining and institutionalising bourgeois capitalist interests. As such, numerous groups on the British Left were critical even in the early days of the UP government's strict adherence to Chilean law while its opponents were more than willing to bend the law in some circumstances, and flagrantly flout it in others, in order to achieve their aim of destabilising the government. The exception to this was the CPGB who, in their publications *Morning Star* and *Marxism Today*, expressed a more sympathetic perspective, identifying with Allende's adherence to the law. This is concluded as being consistent with the CPGB's overall sympathies to the UP and its political strategy of the "democratic road" to socialism. Nonetheless, even in these publications a more "political" interpretation of the law was occasionally offered up, demonstrating that, across the board, the British Left in the 1970s was acutely aware of the political underpinnings of legal structures. This conclusion is further strengthened in subsection iii. where analysis of material from immediately before and after the coup of 1973 evidences a sharpening of the application of Marxism to legal matters by the British Left.

It is when the analysis moves on to material from the 1980s (subsection iv) that a change in the form of legal analysis is first noticed within the British Left. The principal story of the day was the ratification and institution of a new constitution by the junta in 1980 and, as such, much of the articles focussed on this. Two themes emerge within this tranche of source material. The first is a narrowing down in the scope of legal analysis which is first noticed in the *Morning Star* – the daily newspaper of the CPGB. The publication takes on a more "legalistic" approach, espousing a legal positivism in which the law is treated as an irrefutable and logical entity, meaning the publication detaches the law from any connections to socio-economic or political factors. This is explained with the invocation of Kelsen's *grundnorm* thesis, whereby it is postulated that the "legalism" of the *Morning Star* exhibits an implicit acceptance of the basic rationale (*grundnorm* or 'basic norm') that underpins the 1980 constitution. This was then combined with the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, in which this process of identifying with the *grundnorm* is linked to the discursive transference of the discourse of the Master with that of the University, thereby articulating Chile's new legal orientation and foundation as an objective entity to be observed. This echoes the conclusion of the previous analysis chapters, whereby it was ascertained that neoliberal ideology is founded upon the discursive procedure of depoliticisation, which has concurrent effects on subjectivity and material effects (such as upon the way in which legal constructs are conceptualised and articulated). This was also exhibited in other Leftist publications such as *Internconinental Press* and, by the mid 1980s, *Militant.* As such, it is concluded in this chapter that the Left's submission to neoliberal ideological tropes began in the early 1980s, by no coincidence the time when neoliberalism was being instituted on these groups' home soil by

the Thatcher government. This is also in-keeping with the conclusions reached in the previous chapter.

The other main theme that emerges in subsection iv is the narrowing redefinition of Chile's experience under the junta as one predominantly characterised by human rights issues. Whereas in the 1970s the suspension of democracy and political repression was widely interpreted as a classic case of capitalist interests seeking to undermine and destroy working class politics, by the 1980s Chile is instead redrawn by the Left as a lamentable case of human rights abuse. Again, this is first detected in the early 1980s in the reportage of the *Morning Star*, but by the 1990s (detailed in subsection v) this trend is noted across the Left (or at least, what remained of it at that time). Drawing upon the Žižek-Laclau debate of the early 21st century, this recasting of the Chilean experience is understood by this thesis as a case of particularisation and is thus seen as yet more evidence of the Left's submission to neoliberal ideology (particularisation having been identified earlier in this thesis as a classic neoliberal ideological trope). Further to this, the analysis of the 1990s source material throws up the Left's apparent substitution of Marxist theory with ethical considerations, echoing the theoretical underpinnings of the Third Way, a movement that recast the much of the West's centre-left in a neoliberal hue. This adds further credence to the conclusion that, by the close of the 20th century, even the Marxist Left in Britain was subjugated to, and accepting of, neoliberal ideology. Subsection v also provides an opportunity to revisit reflections in the corresponding section in chapter five regarding the two exceptions to the trends noted in both this chapter and the previous one: the SWP and the RCG. Both are noted in chapter five as to have bucked the trend and somewhat avoided the submission to neoliberal ideological tropes suffered by their contemporaries, and it was suggested previously that this may provide insight into why these groups have outlasted the litany of other groups that, by the late 1990s, had dissolved. With regards to the RCG, the findings here require a revisiting of this conclusion as the analysis in subsection v of this chapter suggests that the RCG, when analysing legal issues in its publication *Fight Racism! Fight Imprerialism!*, at times exhibits the same implicit acceptance of the neoliberal new constitutionalism (explored in chapter one). By contrast, however, the SWP, through its publications *Socialist Worker* and *International Socialism*, evidences a withstanding of this and again emerges as an organisation that has remained resistant to neoliberal ideological procedures.

7. The economy: from economics as structure to economics as science

i. Introduction

This chapter marks the end of the analysis of the source material in this research project and is also the penultimate chapter of the thesis, before the conclusion. Having already covered British Leftist discourse on the nature of 'the state' and 'the law', this chapter covers said discourse – and any changes in it – on 'the economy'. Following the research design set out in chapter three, this chapter approaches the source material through the lens of the third of the main critical understandings of neoliberalism: critical political economy (CPE). This approach is concurrently mediated through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis that is utilised throughout this research. Furthermore, the pertinence of economic issues to this thesis is strengthened considering the economic contexts of both Chile and the United Kingdom throughout the period under examination (1970-1999). As has been well established at the outset of this thesis, the replacement of the *Unidad Popular* (UP) government with the military junta in 1973 brought with it a major shift in economic policy, replacing a large state role in the economy with an unprecedented rollback of state intervention, the likes of which had not been seen before, in Chile or elsewhere, on such a scale (Klein 2007). Furthermore, the election of Allende's government in 1970 also introduced a significant break in economic policy, with the country transitioning fairly quickly from one that could be aptly described as a 'mixed economy'[25] under the Eduardo Frei government (1964-1970)[26], to one that experienced widespread nationalisations within a short space of time. In the UK, a similar transition to that experienced by Chile under Pinochet was made at a similarly breakneck pace, albeit later than Chile, following the 1979 general election. The broader context of economics as an academic discipline also merits taking into consideration. The period of 1970-1999 experienced a major shift in economic thinking across the globe. In western policymaking, the once-largely accepted school of Keynesian economic theory was consigned to the historical dustbin and replaced with monetarism[27] as trumpeted by Milton Friedman in the 1970s around the time of the Nixon shock and the oil crises of that decade (Blinder 1988), while Marxian[28] economics was similarly disregarded by the end of the Cold War (Clarke 1988).

[25] The term 'mixed economy' is used here to denote an economy in which parts or wholes of key industries are publicly owned, but one which is nevertheless predominated by 'private ownership and voluntary exchange' (Ikeda 1997: 35). The 'mixed economy' is thus at heart a capitalist one but one in which the state intervenes in a limited capacity 'to address problems identified with laissez-faire capitalism' in order to suit public interest (*ibid.*: 35).

[26] Eduardo Frei's administration embarked upon a programme of expanded government spending and intervention in the economy, including partial nationalisation of the copper industry, agrarian reform, and an expansion of health and education spending. However, the Allende government accelerated and broadened this state intervention in the economy (Collier & Sater 2004).

[27] The terms 'monetarism' and 'monetarist' are used by this thesis to describe the economic programme that is traditionally associated with neoliberalism. In its most literal definition, 'monetarism' is an economic theory that advocates a strict control of the money supply as a means to control inflation (Cagan 2008). However, this thesis expands its definition to include other economic policies associated with 'monetarist' or 'neoliberal' governments. These include a rollback of state involvement in the economy through privatisation and reduced public spending, liberalisation of the financial and banking sectors, liberalisation of trade, and anti-trade union legislation. The expansion of the definition allows for the term to become a 'catch-all' for the economic policies that are commonly associated with the term neoliberalism. Thus, 'monetarism' is not to be read here as synonymous with 'neoliberalism', but only as the economic policy programme that is a constituent part of the neoliberal project.

In line with the previous analysis chapters, this chapter is structured chronologically. This again allows for uniformity and consistency between the analysis chapters. A chronological arrangement allows the tracking of discursive changes amongst the Left alongside the economic changes experienced in Chile and the UK. Section ii covers the analysis of material from 1970-1971, a time when the newly elected UP government embarked upon its multi-industry nationalisation programme. Section iii then looks at the discourse of the Left in 1973 and 1974, a time when Chile's economy was under great strain due to international economic embargoes (led primarily by the United States), domestic supply shortages (particularly food shortages) and industrial unrest. Section iv concerns the material drawn from 1979-1980, a time that marked the resolute imprinting of monetarist economic policy in Chile (by the end of the 1970s the 'Chicago boys' had enacted most of their policies (Silva 2009)) and the beginning of the monetarist age in the United Kingdom (following the 1979 election). Section v then deals with material from 1984-1985, the mid-point of the *Década Perdida* ('Lost Decade'), a time of major economic crisis and contraction that affected not just Chile, but Latin America as a whole. The penultimate section, section vi, covers the analysis of material from 1990-91 and 1998-99. The 1990s can be characterised as a time of great political change but great economic continuity in Chile and the United Kingdom. During this time Chile transitioned to liberal democracy and, in the UK, the Thatcher era came to an end. From an economic perspective, however, continuity was the order of the day as the successive democratic governments in Chile and the Labour government in the UK (from 1997 onwards) all embraced, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, free market economics (Heath et al. 2001; Taylor 2006; Rutland 2013; Dale & Fabry 2018). The chapter ends with concluding remarks in section vii.

ii. 1970-1971: debates within Marxian economics; the *Unidad Popular*'s nationalisation project

It has already been established in this thesis that the election of the UP's Salvador Allende to the Chilean Presidency in 1970 piqued much interest among the British far left. It was postulated in chapters five and six that this was because the new government would provide a test case for the Left, an opportunity to settle the raging debate around socialist strategy (whether socialism could be achieved via existing bourgeois political structures, such as elections, or whether insurrection and direct confrontation with the state was needed). Intimately tied up in this debate are questions over economic strategy. Could socialism be achieved by introducing economic reforms that benefit the working class (thereby gradually transitioning the economy from capitalist to socialist), or is such a strategy futile? It is demonstrated in previous chapters that the British Left could be broadly divided into two camps. The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), the largest party to the left of the Labour Party, adopted the former perspective, with all other groups aligning themselves with the impossibilist line of thinking. Unsurprisingly, therefore, on the day of the 1970 election, the CPGB was quick to exalt the benefits of the UP's reformist economic programme:

[28] Up until now, the term 'Marxist' has been used to describe those observed to be upholding or effusing the writings of Marx, and thinkers who expanded upon his work, as a political belief system. In other words, it is used in this thesis as a description of political belief. 'Marxian' is introduced in this chapter with the purpose of describing specifically the economic analyses offered by Marx and those influenced by him. The terms are not to be taken as being synonymous.

> ‘The programme is fundamentally a Socialist one, aiming to nationalise the natural resources of the country, most important of which is copper, at present in the hands of the American imperialists… [The programme] would go far to ending the poverty and misery of the majority of the over eight million Chilean people. And would also put an end to the US imperialist domination of the country’s economy’ (*Morning Star* September 4th, 1970: 4)

Two things need to be noted here. Firstly, the quote above strikes the tone of a pre-emptive strike. Given the febrile and sectarian nature of the British Left, it comes as little surprise that the CPGB is quick to defend the socialist credentials of the UP’s election promises. Secondly, and more importantly, issues of class and imperialism are immediately raised and put at the forefront of the CPGB’s defence. This is significant because right from the earliest instance, the CPGB demonstrates a reading of economic affairs, specifically capitalist economics, through a Marxian paradigm. Imperialism does not feature as a discussion point in Marx’s *Das Kapital* (Marx’s foundational theoretical text on the capitalist mode of production), but by the 1970s, imperialism had become a focal point in numerous influential works that expanded upon Marx’s central economic thesis, including in Lenin’s *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1999 [1917]) and Rosa Luxemburg’s *The Accumulation of Capital* (2003 [1913]), to name just two. As Winslow states, ‘The outstanding general theory of imperialism, both from the point of view of precedence and of influence, is the Marxian’ (Winslow 1931: 715). Imperialism has thus become one of the cornerstones of Marxism as a form of analysis, despite it not being a term entertained by Marx himself (Harrison 2005).

At this point it is important not to conflate the core tenets of the CPGB with the works of Lenin, Luxemburg, or indeed any other Marxist luminaries of the 20th century. What is being highlighted is that despite the CPGB’s pretensions towards reformism, those writing for the party’s newspaper, the *Morning Star,* in the early 1970s, clearly share elements of an economic analysis that chimes strongly with influential and well-established contributions to Marxian economic thought. Furthermore, despite not mentioning the word ‘class’ in the excerpt quoted above, the author gives an indication that class conflict plays a central role in economic and social relations in Chile, by drawing together the nefarious influence of ‘the American imperialists’ and the ‘poverty and misery of the majority of the over eight million Chilean people’. This is very much in step with Marx’s analysis, specifically historical materialism, which posits that societal development is founded upon the relationship between social classes, and that said relationship is founded upon economic activity (Little 1986; Harvey 2010). The CPGB is thus offering a transparently Marxian analysis of the UP’s proposed economic programme.

This is significant because the other organisations on the British Left offer the same interpretation. A month after the election, an article in *Militant* stated that,

> ‘Only by carrying through a programme of full-scale land reform giving the land to the peasants and of full scale nationalisation giving control of industry to the workers themselves can the new government begin to solve the problems of poverty, underdevelopment and domination by foreign capital’ (Coxhead October 1970: 2)

The only palpable difference between this article and the *Morning Star* one cited above is the tone. The former is celebratory of the UP's programme, the latter very much skeptical. This is unsurprising given the CPGB's and Militant's differing views towards socialist strategy. However, the underlying analysis is very much the same. The author here is calling for economic policies (land reform and nationalisation of industry) that specifically address the class struggle that lies at the heart of Chilean economic and social relations. Issues of poverty, underdevelopment and 'domination by foreign capital' (another hat-tip to imperialism) were significant issues faced by the Allende administration on entering office and can only be systematically and resolutely addressed if the new government takes sides in the class struggle that roots these issues, as the author sees it. Alfredo Garcia, writing in *Intercontinental Press* (affiliated with the British organisation International Marxist Group (IMG)), goes a step further than the *Militant* piece:

> 'In recent decades the country has undergone its greatest rate of growth, its structures have reached their maximum development. Chile cannot move forward qualitatively without destroying the entire existing social framework and the relationship of forces that sustains it' (Garcia October 5th, 1970: 821)

Presented here is a more profound analysis that ties together class conflict, economic relations and the nature of the Chilean state itself. It is described in chapter five how the various groups of the British Left read the Chilean state in the 1970s as one that was constructed with the specific intention of maintaining capitalism. Here, through a brief summation of Chile's economic challenges, the two threads of economics and governance are woven together. Again, this resonates strongly with established Marxist political and economic thought. Another article that appeared a week later in *Intercontinental Press* repeated the same interpretation as that proffered by Garcia. In this article, titled 'Nixon Weighs Possible Alternatives to Allende', Les Evans surmised that, 'The rich have no intention of surrendering even a portion of their privileges to Allende's halfhearted reforms. Immediately after the elections a run on the banks began'. He continues, 'The Central Bank had to supply Santiago banks with 688,000,000 escudos…in the first two weeks of September to cover unexpected withdrawals…Money, and its owners, are flowing out of the country in a steady stream' (Evans October 12th 1970: 841; 842). Capital flight is not being read as an economic issue in isolation, but one that is intimately tied up in class relations (the author identifies a link between ruling class privilege and the bank run) and imperialism (indicated by the title of the article).

By 1971, coverage of the UP had expanded among British Left publications, and this is in line with the mounting problems the UP government faced. Reflecting on the increased militancy of subaltern groups, an article published in *Red Mole* (the newspaper of the IMG) claimed that,

> '[In the 1960s] the Frei government (Christian Democrat) began a timid land reform, trying to rationalise agriculture, to form a rural petit-bourgeoisie and to introduce wage payment in the countryside to open up new markets for industry. It was hoped this would stop the growing peasant upsurge. But this reform increased rural unemployment (thus setting off a migration to the towns) and caused a new mobilisation of the peasant masses' (February 1st-15th 1971: 9**)**

The author draws a link between social change (migration), economic relations (land reform and the petty-bourgeoisie) and class struggle ('mobilisation of the peasant masses') – more historical materialist analysis. Numerous articles appeared of a similar nature that explored the theme of increased militancy from the Right during 1971. Writing in *Intercontinental Press*, Jean-Pierre Beauvais linked the struggles of the Chilean economy to a purposeful manoeuvre on behalf of the ruling class to destabilise the UP government and, by extension, its support base:

> 'The bourgeoisie and the imperialists are already waging a real fight on the economic level…Measures severely restricting credit, banning loans, and limiting or halting investment are already in force. And they will quickly put the Chilean economy…in a difficult position, forcing Allende to resort to austerity measures which will cut down on the prestige and popular support he enjoys' (Beauvais May 10th 1971: 433)

These sentiments are echoed in 'Chile: Popular Front leading to disaster' (published in *Militant* (Woods October 1st, 1971)) and 'The Real Perspective Facing the Chilean Masses' (published in *Intercontinental Press* (January 25th, 1971)). Thus, across the various groups and strands of the British Left, what emerges is a commonality that binds them: the Chilean economy is uniformly interpreted through an analytical frame that relies upon cornerstones of Marxian economic theory, including historical materialism, class struggle and imperialism. With the advent of the coup in late 1973, this analysis hardens.

iii. 1973-1974: the capitalists' coup and the Marxian analysis

Throughout 1973, in the run up to the coup, Chile faced major economic challenges. Industrial unrest and supply-chain shortages (particularly food shortages) stifled economic progress. It has been well-documented by political scientists and historians that these challenges had been purposefully orchestrated by opponents to the Allende government within the business community (domestic and international) and had been bolstered by a hostile White House (Blum 2004; Verdugo 2004; Weiner 2007; Qureshi 2009; Harmer 2011). What is immediately noticeable from the source material analysed in this research is that writers in British Left publications were very much alive to the economic sabotage being waged by Allende's opponents. Various publications across the Left published numerous articles highlighting the link between the government's opposition, the business community, the US and the ailing economy. *Socialist Worker* (newspaper of the International Socialists) was particularly keen on this, publishing four articles dedicated to it in the eight months prior to the coup (Harman March 31st 1973; Roxborough & Richards May 19th 1973; *Socialist Worker* June 2nd 1973; Richards July 7th 1973). *Militant* also covered the acts of economic sabotage (Benton March 9th 1973), as did *Red Weekly* (formerly *Red Mole*) (Frazer August 31st 1973). As Benton claimed in his *Militant* article, 'The aims and intentions of the UP government have been frustrated at each turn by the capitalist interests which control the economy, and by the world market to which the economy is tied up' (Benton March 9th 1973: 4). By drawing 'capitalist interests' and 'the world market' together with the overall economic picture, Benton echoes the sentiments of the other articles cited here, and those discussed in the previous section: that economic matters are intimately tied up in class conflict and imperialism, demonstrating a clear continuation of a Marxian interpretation of Chile's capitalist economy.

Following the coup, the connection between the ousting of the UP government and economic relations is made by even more groups on the British Left. The economy in post-coup Chile becomes one of the biggest talking points for the Left. For the most part, the economic analysis that has been shared among the Left since 1970 becomes more widespread. *Morning Star*, newspaper of the CPGB and an unequivocal supporter of the Allende administration, claimed, 'It is virtually certain that the CIA and the giant US corporations were actively involved in the coup preparations' (September 14th 1973: 1). This focus on economic imperialism as a fundamental contributory factor in the coup is later echoed in the party's theoretical journal *Marxism Today*:

> 'The fact is that, right from the beginning of the Popular Unity government, the North American monopolies that dominated the Chilean economy (copper, ITT) and leading groups in the US administration undertook systematic action on all levels – from economic warfare to open subversion – to bring about the failure of the Allende government and overthrow it' (Berlinguer February 1974: 40)

These are sentiments also expressed in *Intercontinental Press* (September 24th 1973; Roberts October 8th 1973), the non-aligned *New Left Review* (McMichael et al. 1974) and *Red Weekly* (Balfour November 2nd 1973), demonstrating a universal application of Marxian economic analysis. What is most noteworthy, however, about the tranche of source material drawn from this period, is that focus quickly shifts onto the economic programme of the incoming junta. In the days and months immediately after the coup, the economic programme of the Pinochet-led military regime was not one that could be immediately identified as 'neoliberal' or 'monetarist'. However, by the end of 1974, a group of US-educated Chilean economists, known as the 'Chicago Boys', were in control of 'most of the centres of economic planning' (Silva 2009: 149). Thus, within little over a year the regime's economic strategy was in the hands of a group of economists who had, for over a decade, been drawing up a package of economic reforms in the image of Milton Friedman (*ibid.*). While the groups of the British Left did not use terms such as 'neoliberal' or 'monetarist' to describe the junta's economic platform at this early stage, the Left was nonetheless acutely aware of the new economic direction in which the junta was taking Chile, and the impact that was having on the Chilean working class:

> 'You must go into the working class communities to see the pain in Chile today. To see the wives put onto the streets by men who cannot get a job. To see kids with no clothes and no food. To see the men twisted and mutilated at the hands of the military torturers. To see workers' homes bare because all the furniture has been sold or pawned to buy food' (Light & Fenn December 21st 1974: 8-9)

In this one quotation (which comes from a *Socialist Worker* article) it can be seen how a focus on class is still an important trope for Leftist analyses of the Chilean economy. What's more, the authors draw a direct link between the junta's actions and the economic reality. This harkens back to chapter five, in which it was discussed at length how, in the 1970s, the Left understood the state as having a central role in shaping class-economic relations. That is to say, the state is read here by the reporters in *Socialist Worker,* as having the power to have a direct effect on Chile's economy and the class relations that underpin it. It was explored in

chapter five how this analysis is typical of a Marxist interpretation of the state, and again it is repeated here. Jean-Pierre Beauvais' piece in *Red Weekly* in March 1974 is another prime example of such analysis:

> 'To revive the economy and attract investment from the imperialist powers requires the super-exploitation of the Chilean workers, the abolition of social benefits won through years of glorious struggle, and the passivity and obedience of a working class whose traditions of independence, organisation and militancy are unique in Latin America' (March 1st 1974: 6)

Class struggle, exploitation, imperialism – themes that in the early 1970s were recurrent throughout Leftist reportage on Chile. It is concluded in chapter five that this analysis of the state (that it is a structure built with the explicit aim of entrenching and protecting capitalist interests, and thus the integrity of the capitalist economy) was evidence of the Left withstanding key tropes of neoliberal discoursal practice. This conclusion is reached by drawing a comparison between the source material from the Left and that from *The Economist* (explored in chapter four), whereby it was established that *The Economist* sought to depoliticise the state in the wake of the coup, whereas the Left did not. The same can be said of the analysis of the economy. Similar to its treatment of the state, *The Economist* sought immediately to strip the political element from the economy and, by extension, the central role the state plays in economic affairs. Utilising the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis developed throughout this thesis, it is postulated that, in depoliticising the state and the economy (and the relationship between the two), right-wing voices such as *The Economist* sought to substitute the discourse of the Master with the discourse of the University in order to portray the impending imposition of neoliberalism as an objective and natural process, rather than as an ideological project. In maintaining the class-based interpretation of the economy, the Left here is demonstrating a withstanding to this process of discursive transference. This is in-keeping with the findings in chapters five and six. However, as the 1970s come to an end, and the 1980s begin, this steadfast application of and adherence to Marxian economic analysis wavers.

iv. 1979-1980: Thatcher's election; 'monetarism' becomes Leftist vocabulary; Leftist analyses of the economy diversify

At the close of the 1970s, the monetarist economic project was fully underway in Chile. At the same time, the beginning of the monetarist era in the UK was marked with the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979. The entrenchment of this economic programme in Chile would be confirmed a year later in 1980 when the new constitution – designed specifically to imprint on Chile a neoliberal governance and economic framework – was ratified. This is a crucial period in the history of contemporary capitalism as it marks a time when neoliberalism is institutionalised (at a constitutional level) in its first experiment (Chile) and begins in one of the centres of global capital (the UK). During this time, the British Left's interest in Chile persisted, though the amount of coverage dedicated to it in Leftist publications waned somewhat compared to the early 1970s. Nevertheless, there is some material from this period that is ripe for analysis, and some interesting trends emerge. Firstly, there is a desire to revisit and re-analyse the 1973 coup. This is prominent in *Socialist Challenge* (formerly *Red*

Mole and *Red Weekly*). Writing in an article published in September 1980, Phil Hearse declared:

> 'The successes of Popular Unity were purchased at a high price. Because the financial institutions and banks were not taken over, the government had to borrow huge amounts. Inflation began to increase alarmingly…As the economy got in worse trouble, foreign companies refused to invest in Chile…Because of the limitations on the economic power of the government – above all the fact that they didn't completely take over *all* the major firms and the financial institutions – it was possible for the bosses and the middle class to begin to sabotage the economy. With much more extensive nationalisations it would have been impossible, with a state monopoly of foreign trade to guard the economy against the sabotage of imperialism' (Hearse September 11th, 1980: 8)

There are multiple parts of the above excerpt that merit attention. This excerpt has been pieced together from different parts of the article in order to contrast different aspects of the author's analysis. Firstly, the overriding impression of this article is that the author is particularly concerned with policy. This is in stark contrast to coverage in both this paper and others in the early 1970s. At the beginning of the decade, both supporting voices (namely, the *Morning Star*) and dissenting voices (every other group/publication) of the Allende government directed their analytical attention towards issues of imperialism and class conflict. The articles discussed in previous sections talked vaguely about specific economic policies of the UP government, if at all, and the emphasis of these earlier articles was much more on Marxist rhetoric. This contrasts with the excerpt offered here. The UP's defeat is in part put down to its failure to fully nationalise key sectors of the economy. A new frame for analysis is thus offered: the idea that there is such a thing as good and bad policy within a capitalist economy. This new paradigm echoes somewhat more 'moderate'[29] Leftist approaches to economics and is thus a step away from Marxian interpretations. The introduction of 'inflation' as a primary economic concern strengthens this conclusion. The context of the economic environment in the Global North needs taking into consideration here. The 1970s is widely recognised as the decade when Keynesian approaches to economic policymaking were replaced as the accepted economic doctrine in western governance by monetarist approaches (Clarke 1988; Stedman Jones 2012). The former can be characterised as advocating counter-cyclical government spending and a focus on full employment, whereas the latter advocates government withdrawal from the economy and stresses inflation as the primary economic concern for policymakers (Madra & Adaman 2018). The introduction of inflation as a talking point by *Socialist Challenge* echoes this shift, as neither Marxian economics nor Keynesian economics stress the importance of inflation. By discussing inflation, the author signals that this issue is now a key one in economic debates. The implication of good versus bad policy within capitalist economics chimes with existing CPE understandings of neoliberalism (reviewed in chapter one). This new frame of analysis offered by the above article echoes the specific insight of CPE that neoliberalism is an economic regime that stresses scientific positivism. In other words, there is a correct and incorrect way of managing the economy. The neoliberal approach naturally offers itself up as the correct

[29] The word 'moderate' is used in this chapter not in a normative sense, but as a way of designating economic approaches that emphasise policy reforms within capitalist economies rather than insurrectionary approaches aimed at overthrowing and replacing the capitalist system entirely.

way, whereas in the above-quoted article, neoliberalism is articulated as the incorrect way. This feeds into a broader theme uncovered by the CPE approach which stipulates that neoliberalism also relies upon the conceptualisation of the individual as a rational agent that makes good or bad decisions. The implication being that incorrect policy is a bad decision. Overall, therefore, what this subtle shift in discourse evidences is an implicit acceptance of the neoliberal frame of understanding economics: economic policymaking is a scientific endeavour that is solely the consequence of the decisions of the policymaker. This is a profound shift away from Marxian critiques which emphasise structural influences.

It would be wrong, however, to assert that the author has stepped away completely from Marxian economic interpretation, as issues of class and imperialism still remain in his analysis. However, despite the direct discussion of these concepts, the way in which they are discussed further adds to the point that the author is demonstrating a development in Leftist economic analysis. First and foremost, the economic war waged by 'the middle class', as Hearse puts it, is enabled and facilitated by the (poor) policy choices of the UP government, rather than by the structural facets of the capitalist economy. Hearse postulates that had the Allende administration adopted the "right" economic policies (i.e. full nationalisation of the economy) then this economic sabotage would not have been possible. Class conflict, therefore, is a by-product of (bad) public policy rather than an integral feature of the capitalist economy itself. This is clearly a step away from the form of analysis popular in the early 1970s. Secondly, the term 'foreign investors' requires attention. Again, in the early 1970s, foreign economic actors, such as multinational corporations (typically US corporations) were understood by the Left as being agents that have a direct role in the imperialist domination of underdeveloped nations such as Chile. They were a reflection of the class struggle on an international scale. Here, however, they are designated a curious passivity, as agents who merely react to changing economic environments: 'as the economy got in worse trouble, foreign companies refused to invest in Chile'. The fact that this is portrayed as a bad thing is all the more curious, as these very same companies were lambasted in the early 1970s by the Left as having nothing but a negative and predatory influence on the Chilean national economy. The author has thus stripped these 'foreign companies' of their political capacity. This echoes not just the same discursive procedure of depoliticisation of both the state (as evidenced in chapter five) and the law (discussed in chapter six) by the Left, but also mimics the same depoliticisation of economic actors offered by *The Economist* (explored at length in chapter three). Once again, this reflects the scientific positivism that underpins the neoliberal approach to economics. While it would be too much of a stretch to claim that this one article demonstrates the complete submission of the Left to neoliberal ideological tropes (the depoliticisation of the economy being one such trope), what this article does indicate is at the very least an acceptance by *Socialist Challenge* of the new frames of analysis established by the unfolding neoliberal landscape. This understanding, derived from aforementioned CPE approaches, can be mediated through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis used throughout this thesis. The act of depoliticisation of the economy is another reflection of the broader discursive transference of key concepts, whereby the entire field of economics is imbued with the University discourse. The notion of good and bad policy is a reflection of this discursive procedure. *Socialist Challenge* was not alone in this. In an article comparing the Chilean junta with the Thatcher government in the UK, *Socialist Worker's* Ian Birchall wrote in 1979,

> ‘There’s only one snag about this Tory dreamland [Chile]. It doesn’t work. Six years of military dictatorship have left the Chilean economy in a catastrophic mess. If anyone tells you that greedy trade unionists cause inflation, tell them to look at Chile’ (Birchall September 15th, 1979: 7)

Inflation again emerges as a principal economic concern, and on top of this, the link between inflation and trade unionism is raised (and strongly refuted). The significance of this is that it reflects the debates that were raging in the UK at the time. The Conservative Party fought the 1979 election on the monetarist idea that industrial militancy was the root cause of the UK’s economic woes. This argument was strongly rebuffed by the Labour campaign (Butler & Kavanagh 1980). The quote above therefore reflects not Marxian economic analysis but instead the debate between two other competing economic theories: Keynesianism and Monetarism. The term ‘monetarism’ became increasingly common in the UK around this time, and the Left’s reportage of Chile also reflects this. Two articles published in *Militant* make direct use of the word:

> ‘The [Chilean] economy is still labouring under the monetarist Chicago school of Milton Friedman. Although some industries have begun to grow, inflation is still running at 80%’ (July 13th, 1979: 10-11)

> ‘The Tories in Britain around Thatcher and her economic axeman Joseph are continually stressing the long term advantages of “monetarism”. But a glance at Chile, where a “monetarist” experiment started with the military coup of September 11th 1973 shows the end result for the working class’ (Bober September 5th, 1980: 11).

This is another subtle yet significant signal that the Left’s economic analysis is changing. There is a shift away from arguing against capitalism as a whole, to arguing against ‘monetarism’, one policy approach within capitalism.

This change in narrative by the Left was not uniform, however. An article published in 1979 in *New Left Review* testifies to the fact that voices still remained on the Left that were keen to promote Marxian critiques of the economy and of the state in capitalist societies. Below is a lengthy but important passage from this article, titled ‘The State in the Transitional Period’:

> ‘The weakness of Kautsky’s argument can neither confirm nor invalidate the Leninist thesis. What could substantiate it would be historical experience, for what it is worth. If we look at it, we must admit that up till now no workers’ party with an openly revolutionary programme – in the sense of one calling for a change in the social relations of production – has ever won in general elections in a capitalist country. Everything happens as if, for such a programme, there were an absolute upper limit of about 25 per cent of the electoral body. By contrast, this limit is easily transcended – and an absolute majority itself can in certain cases be achieved – by a left-wing party presenting a programme of reforms within the capitalist mode of production. The French Popular Front in 1936, the contemporary French Union of the Left and the Italian Communist Party are cases in point. It can be said that Allende’s Chile was a border-line case, in terms of three separate criteria: 1. The economic development of the country, which was quite significant, but fell short of that of great industrial

countries; 2. The programme of *Unidad Popular,* which was quite advanced, but remained within the limits of what a capitalist system could absorb without being annihilated; 3. The successive electoral results, which constantly approached, but still fell short of an absolute majority' (Emmanuel 1979: 120)

This article was written by Arghiri Emmanuel, a French-Greek Marxian economist who was famed for his much-disputed theory of unequal exchange (Jedlicki 2001). Putting Emmanuel's contested theory to one side, it is important to consider that an important Marxian economist maintains the idea that the UP government was not an anti-capitalist one, for it pursued an economic platform 'within the limits of what a capitalist system could absorb'. Furthermore, he maintains the link between economics and the state, as the article concerns debates over socialist strategy (the Kautsky position of reform versus the insurrectionary strategy advocated by Lenin). The consequence of this is an apparent divergence between the analyses of Marxist intellectuals and those of Marxist parties (whose analyses can be seen through the publications analysed in this thesis). This opens up a potential further line of enquiry into possible ruptures between left-wing intellectuals and left-wing activists, with the latter accepting the changing landscape of economic debate in capitalist countries, and the former clinging to Marxian economics. Unfortunately, the source material analysed in this thesis does not provide sufficient evidence to explore this possible fissure, but this at least opens up the possibility for further research in the future.

v. 1984-1985: The *Década Perdida* and the Left's move away from Marxian rhetoric

The move away from Marxian economics amongst the Left accelerated in the mid-1980s. This period was ripe for Leftist coverage of Latin America as a whole, and Chile in particular, owing to the severe economic slump in the region known as the *Década Perdida*. The 'Lost Decade' was ultimately a debt crisis, whereby many Latin American nations, which had built up vast amounts of debt to foreign creditors in the decades before, reached a point of being unable to repay that debt. Many of these nations' economies relied on exporting natural resources, but when international commodity prices fell in the early 1980s, these nations' earning power collapsed and their ability to service these debts evaporated (Osvald & Griffith-Jones 1986). Chile was especially badly affected and suffered a great economic crisis in 1982, one of the worst since the Great Depression of the 1930s (Barandiarán & Hernández December 1999). Chile's dependence on external credit was a direct result of the investment slump created in the wake of the Chicago boys' reforms of the 1970s. Following dramatic reductions in public spending, privatisations of key industries and liberalisation of the financial sector, private and public debt levels soared as liquidity shortages were sought to be plugged via external credit financing (Ffrench-Davis 2002). The Latin American debt crisis of the 1980s hit Chile particularly hard, with GDP falling by 14% between 1982 and 1983, compared the the average decline of 3.2% in the same period across Latin America (*ibid.*: 18). During the same period, the UK was in the midst of its own monetarist experiment. The 1980s saw the privatisation of pillars of the British economy, the financial sector was heavily deregulated and strict anti-trade union legislation was introduced. The Thatcher government's long-running battle with the trade unions culminated in the infamous Miners' strike of 1984-1985, which ended in victory for the government. This is widely seen as a watershed moment for the government and its monetarist economic agenda (Beckett & Hencke 2009; Perchard 2013; Paterson 2014)

and is interpreted by this thesis as the "tipping point" for the entrenchment of neoliberalism as the hegemonic ideology in the UK. Given the contexts in Chile and the UK, it is of no surprise that economic issues remained pertinent to the British Left in its coverage of Chile in the 1980s.

The bulk of the coverage across the various left-wing publications continued the trend of moving away from Marxian terms of reference and analysis and towards analysis that focussed predominantly on public policy. This trend intensified as particular vocabulary became much more commonplace among the Left. The use of the term 'monetarism' was much more widespread, and many commentators adopted the phrase 'Chicago boys' when referring to the architects of Chile's neoliberal turn. As Kate Clark reported in the *Morning Star,* 'Many owners of small business who previously supported Pinochet have seen their standard of living drop dramatically due to the monetarist policies of the "Chicago boys", the Chilean economists schooled by Milton Friedman' (Clark September 11th, 1984: 2). Clark continues, 'High US interest rates and the low international copper price have not helped the regime's problems. Chile's foreign debt stands at 22 billion dollars. Unemployment is at 30 per cent and this includes many professional people' (*ibid.*: 2). Alongside the use of the aforementioned terms is a noticeable commentary on policy. This is a continuation of what was noted in the previous section, that the Left has accepted the concept that good and bad policy exists. Notions of class have all but been removed. Where once it would be expected that a paper such as the *Morning Star* would talk of class struggle and bourgeois domination, these terms have been replaced by ones such as 'small business owners.' The class conflict has been displaced onto macroeconomic policymaking. This is significant as it reflects a move from Marxian rhetoric towards other forms of economic analysis that promote policy reforms within a capitalist system. Indeed, the critique offered here by the *Morning Star* journalist resonates strongly with Keynesian critiques of monetarism. The focus on unemployment and living standards is particularly Keynesian: 'Keynes's remedies [for a failing economy] have some unifying characteristics. All are aimed at a buoyant economy and high levels of employment and avoidance of cyclical instability' (Chick & Dow 2013: 16). Keynesian language also appears when Clark discusses interest rates and the international copper price. In the words of the author, 'high US interest rates and the low international copper price have not helped the regime's problems.' It cannot be stressed strongly enough how remarkable this sentence is. US interest rates and international commodity prices are discussed as if they are naturally occurring phenomena. There is no discussion of imperialist domination. These contributory factors to Chile's economic problems are referred to as processes that must be dealt with sufficiently by appropriate policy, rather than as ones bound up in the class struggle that underpins the global capitalist economy.

It has been pointed out throughout this thesis that the CPGB was more moderate than its rival organisations in the British Left, insofar as the group repeatedly distanced itself from revolutionary strategy. Thus, one could be forgiven for assuming that it is to be expected that the *Morning Star* would discuss the Chilean economy in much more moderate language. However, the publications of other left-wing groups were guilty of exhibiting the same analytical "climb down", as it were. Alan Woods, writing in *Militant*, claimed in April 1984 that,

> 'the ruling class, the Junta itself, is split from top to bottom. This has arisen from the catastrophe which confronts Chilean society in every sphere [the economic crisis], and has been aggravated by the monetarist measures so enthusiastically applied in Pinochet's early years' (Woods April 27th 1984: 10).

The second part of that quotation merits re-emphasising: 'has been aggravated by the monetarist measures.' Note that the 'catastrophe' of the economic crisis has not been caused by the junta's monetarist policies, rather it was only made worse by them. Policy is at fault, not capitalism itself. The *Intercontinental Press* followed a similar line of analysis: 'Pinochet…shifted to policies aimed at stimulating economic growth and easing the burden on the middle-class layers that were turning against the regime. Such measures have had little real impact' (Murphy October 15th, 1984: 596). The displacement of the class conflict onto public policy and the depoliticisation of key economic actors (such as the US government and multinational corporations) is a recurring theme by the 1980s. There is a shift away from language and terms of reference that could be easily identifiable as Marxian (such as 'class' or 'imperialism', or even 'capitalism') to ones that are much more in tune with more 'orthodox'[30] economic theories ('inflation', 'investment' and so on). This further strengthens the findings of the previous subsection. What is being evidenced here is an imbuing of economics with the discourse of the University, entrenching within economics a scientific positivism, and an articulation of economic actors and policymakers as rational entities that make decisions through cost-benefit analyses.

This notwithstanding, however, it would be too much to claim resolutely that by the mid-1980s the British Left had abandoned Marxian economics and embraced the theories of Keynes, or indeed any other school of economics. The material analysed here does not provide the evidence to make such a claim. Nevertheless, the shift in rhetoric by the Left is palpable and merits further consideration, for the unavoidable question that now presents itself is, why did the Left seemingly abandon discussions *of* capitalism in favour of discussions *within* capitalism? In order to answer this, it is necessary to return to some of the conclusions offered in chapters five and six of this thesis. It was noted in both chapters that as the 1970s became the 1980s, the Left almost universally exhibited a discursive transition, moving away from Marxist interpretations of the state (chapter five) and the law (chapter six), and towards language that mimicked that of neoliberalism – one that depoliticised these concepts. The state was no longer seen as a political construct that needed to be overcome, and the law was accepted as being something to be observed rather than challenged. When it comes to the economy, however, the acceptance of neoliberal discursive tropes is not quite so definitive. At no point do any articles praise the monetarist economic policies of the junta. What does appear to have changed though is the moving from one oppositional approach to capitalism (Marxism), to a more specific oppositional approach to monetarism (evidenced in the more orthodox Keynesian-esque language). This, however, does not mean that when it comes to economic analysis the Left has managed to withstand the ideological-discursive procedures of neoliberalism, and to fully understand why, Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis provides merits reintroducing at this point. Despite evidencing a continual rejection of monetarist economic policies, the Left – as evidenced in the articles cited – pursues the same depoliticisation that was found in chapters five and six. As the fluctuations of the global

[30] The term 'orthodox' is used here to refer to economic theories that have been at one point broadly accepted in public policy arenas, such as Keynesianism and Neoclassical economics, as opposed to the 'heterodox' Marxian schools.

economy are now understood as being something against which Chile should be insulated through appropriate policy, the economy itself has been imbued with that same University discourse that is encumbered upon the state and the law. In the context of the *Década Perdida*, the continent-wide economic collapse is not interpreted through Marx's theory of crisis but is instead accepted as part and parcel of the realities of contemporary economics. This demonstrates an understanding of economics as if it were a field of natural science: crises happen as if they are naturally occurring phenomena. Despite not accepting monetarism as a viable economic programme, the Left has still accepted the terms of reference in which capitalist schools of economic thought – such as monetarism, and its age-old opponent Keynesianism – entertain, understand and analyse the global economy. What is emerging from this chapter, therefore, is the suggestion that the efficacy of neoliberalism as an ideology lies in its discursive functioning, its effects on language. This means that one does not have to accept the monetarist economic programme that is intimately tied up in the neoliberal project in order for one to submit to neoliberalism's ideological function. It is language that is key, not specific economic policies, to neoliberalism. This idea is explored in further depth in the next section where source material is used to analyse the Left's reflections on Chile's monetarist experiment in hindsight, following the end of the Cold War, the end of Thatcherism in the UK and the end of junta rule in Chile.

vi. The nineties: *plus ça change…*

As has been found in the previous chapters, source material from Leftist publications during the 1990s is much thinner. This is unsurprising given the number of groups – and thus their associated publications – that folded around the time of the end of the Cold War. Nevertheless, the small amount of material available from the 1990s still offers up some interesting discussion points. What differentiates this tranche of source material compared to that in previous chapters, is that the articles in this decade that discuss Chile's economy only do so by revisiting the coup and the junta's rule. This is in contrast to articles that deal with state and legal matters, which deal with contemporary issues (such as the democratic transition and Pinochet's indictment), as well as looking back at Chile's recent history. What is also striking about this source material is that much of it uses maxims and vocabulary that one could consider to be part and parcel of Marxian economic analyses. The following quotation is a case in point: 'Pinochet's coup was applauded by the Chilean middle classes, but he had to ensure American support and arms supplies by aligning himself with the monopolists, the interests closest to Washington and world capitalism' (Kiernan 1990: 93). This quote is taken from an article published in the non-aligned *New Left Review.* Issues such as 'class', 'imperialism' (alluded to through a reference to 'Washington'), and 'capitalism' are engaged with directly here, echoing language that was used in abundance in Leftist analyses in the early 1970s. However, the article also slips in and out of the more moderate language that was uncovered in the previous two sections:

> 'It is hard to say at any moment whether the state is guiding capitalism, or capitalism leading the state by the nose. Neither has leisure or taste for long-term planning; both are reduced to hasty, improvised decisions, to get them out of one awkward corner into another – hand to mouth tactics with no more distant perspective than the next election of the balance sheet for the next shareholders' meeting. Questioners are referred to the "market" for answers' (*ibid.*: 94)

Note first the delineation of 'the state' from 'capitalism'. The author appears to distance himself from the idea that the state and capitalism are inherently tied up in the same process. The author specifically delineates the two, rather than use a term such as 'capitalist state', which was commonly used in the 1970s by writers on the Left. Furthermore, the criticism that 'neither has the leisure or taste for long-term planning' is also noteworthy as it echoes, once more, language that is more akin to Keynesian critiques of free market economics, namely that the monetarist approach to public policy was too short-termist. As Stedman Jones writes, 'Keynes retained a faith in a technocratic elite as the guardian of social progress' (Stedman Jones 2012: 622). In his *New Left Review* article here, it appears Kiernan is bemoaning the lack of such joined-up forward thinking in contemporary economic policymaking. Overall, the article cited here portrays a picture of a continuation of the depoliticisation of the economy by writers on the British Left. Writing two years before, in 1988, Mike Haynes claimed in *International Socialism* (theoretical journal of the Socialist Workers Party, formerly the International Socialists),

> 'Although the repression of Pinochet and his eccentricities lost him support amongst sections of the ruling class in Chile itself and some of his original international backers, Chile remains a respected member of the international economic community. Whereas, under Allende, loans and aid had been increasingly denied, the coup made Chile look much more attractive. Subject to the ups and downs of the world economy, foreign investment has been buoyant' (Haynes 1988: 14)

Again, in an article dedicated to criticising monetarist economics (the article is titled 'Nightmares of the Market: Chile, Yugoslavia and Hungary') there appears a subtle depoliticisation of the economy. Global economic fluctuations are portrayed as if they were naturally occurring to which Chile was and is simply 'subject'. International influence on the Chilean economy is merely 'foreign investment'. The fact that such language appears in an *International Socialism* article is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it was found in previous chapters that the SWP exhibited somewhat of a resistance to neoliberal discoursal procedures, in contrast to other Leftist groups. It was suggested in chapter five that this ought to be considered a reason as to why the SWP has remained in existence and, furthermore, somewhat strong and influential in British left-wing politics. The article cited here appears to muddy that conclusion as the language falls in line with the trend of depoliticisation exhibited by the publications of other left-wing parties. Secondly, an article published ten years later in the party's newspaper *Socialist Worker* demonstrates a reversal of this trend, utilising language that has parallels with the Marxian analysis that was predominant in the early 1970s. Reflecting on the 1973 coup, an unnamed reporter wrote that,

> 'the capitalists wanted the workers' movement smashed. They were backed by US political leaders like Henry Kissinger and President Nixon…In August 1973 the bosses and middle classes again mounted an offensive, hoarding goods to create scarcity, crippling production and moving money out of the country' (*Socialist Worker* December 5th, 1998: 9).

This article certainly would not have looked out of place had it been published 25 years earlier, as the author adeptly perceives the links between Chile's ailing economy, imperialist

powers and class conflict. This suggests that, for the SWP, Marxian economic analysis is still operable when examining past political and economic processes. However, when it comes to understanding contemporary economic issues, other analytical lenses and terms of reference are needed. It is as if Marxian economic analysis is suitable for 'mixed economy Chile', but not for 'monetarist Chile'. It is important to stress that the limited amount of material available for analysis means that this is not a resolute conclusion, however it does suggest a possible line of further inquiry into the ways in which existing Left groups utilise Marxist theory to understand past and present events. This further supports the conclusion of the previous two chapters that in any future study of Britain's Left, the ways in which those groups that still exist engage with Marxist theory may hold some significance in understanding why those groups persist while the litany of others folded around the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The final article that merits serious thought in this tranche of source material is one that was published in *New Left Review* in 1999. Another reflective piece, the article is titled 'Chile, a Quarter of a Century on'. Below are two excerpts:

> 'Since 1970, Chilean GDP has tripled. rollercoasting down throughout the two deep crises in 1975 and 1982 and up again into a steep and, up until now, uninterrupted 7.8 per cent mean annual growth rate from 1985 to 1997. In fact, during this twelve-year long growth spree, the Chilean economy has been one of the world's most dynamic' (Riesco 1999: 103)
>
> 'It therefore seems certain that, thirty years after Allende's election in 1970, another Socialist will become president of Chile, with ample popular support. He will govern a different country in a different world. No radical measures, such as agrarian reform or copper nationalisation, seem necessary this time for the country's continuing advance on the road to modernity' (*ibid.*: 124)

The article is astonishingly agreeable in tone to the supposed 'benefits' of the junta's economic programme. It is even more astonishing when the author himself is taken into consideration. Manuel Riesco Larraín (credited in the article as Manuel Riesco) is an economist and long-time member (and occasional parliamentary candidate) of the PCCh. Before continuing the dissection of this piece, it must first be acknowledged that the article is not wholly praiseworthy of the economic direction taken by the junta, nor does Ricardo Lagos (incoming President and leader of the Socialist Party) evade the author's criticism. The author repeatedly attacks Chile's market economy for creating major income inequality and is skeptical, to say the least, of Lagos' left-wing credentials. Nonetheless, Riesco quietly acknowledges the supposed economic progress achieved by Pinochet without putting it under major scrutiny (save for the comments about inequality). Nor does Riesco discuss issues such as class conflict or economic imperialism (mainstays of Marxian economic analysis). Riesco also refers to copper nationalisation and agrarian reform as 'radical', extraordinary considering the fact that both these policies were pursued not just by Allende in the 1970s, but by his PDC predecessor Eduardo Frei. The quiet acceptance of the benefits of free markets on the one hand, coupled with the obvious disquiet about poverty on the other, speaks to the greater process of left-wing renewal that was experienced in the late 1980s and 1990s by the established parties of the Chilean Left (the PS and PCCh) and the established centre-left party in the UK (the Labour Party), whereby these parties all came to accept the doctrine of free

markets while at the same time advocating a greater public focus on social justice (Giddens 1998; Newman & De Zoysa 2001; Taylor 2006). This acceptance of some of the advantages of monetarist economic policy by Riesco is more evidence of a general obedience by the Left to neoliberal ideology, as Riesco himself demonstrates a rejection of Marxian economics and an acquiescence of more moderate economic thinking.

This section and the previous one give rise to a striking conclusion: that despite the fact that the British Left has at no point fully embraced monetarist economics (Riesco's *New Left Review* piece coming closest to that position), the depoliticisation of the economy by the Left in the 1980s and 1990s still reflects the broader ideology of neoliberalism. This conclusion is strengthened when the context of the emergence of monetarist economics (and with it, the neoliberal project) is taken into consideration. Economic historians have pinpointed the development of monetarism as having been borne out of right-wing intellectual critiques of Keynesian economics (Palley 2005; Stedman Jones 2012). As Keynesianism became more and more discredited with the onset of the oil shocks in the late 1970s, monetarism became more influential in academic and governmental circles. With the growing influence of monetarism, revisions and adaptations were made by economic theorists to both Keynesianism and Marxian economic theory (Howard & King 1992; Spencer 2000; Davidson 2011; Eatwell & Milgate 2011), and post-Keynesian (such as the work of Michal Kalecki and Nicholas Kaldor) and Neo-Marxian (such as the French 'Regulationist' school) schools of thought grew in popularity in oppositional circles to monetarist dominance. The general trend can be described as one of 'economization' (Madra & Adaman 2018), whereby the growing popularity and dominance of monetarism in the field of economics reshaped the terms and landscape of economic debate. The focus shifted from debates *about* capitalism (the answer to which Keynesians would claim capitalism should be reformed, and Marxians would claim it should be destroyed (Chick & Dow 2013)), to debates *within* capitalism (and how and to what extent capitalism should be managed through public policy). Spencer claims that there has been an acceptance of monetarist frameworks, concepts and methodologies within anti-monetarist traditions, which has led more radical economists to having 'denied themselves the opportunity to elucidate both the bases of capitalist class conflict, and the nature of more complex social interactions at the point of production' (Spencer 2000: 543). Spencer notes that 'moves towards neoclassicism inevitably deny space for the enunciation of a radical agenda' (*ibid.*: 561). Returning to existing CPE approaches to neoliberalism, what Spencer describes is the central importance of positivism and the scientific method to neoliberal economics. Mediating once more through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, this reformulation of the entire field of economic study reflects the broader process of discursive transference. Economics is now a discipline of objectivity, heavily imbued with the discourse of the University.

In other words, by acceding to the change in the terms of economic debate and analysis that was brought about by the rise of neoliberal economics (aka monetarism), those on the Left have implicitly extricated themselves from key facets of Marxian economic analysis, and thus have succumbed to the neoliberal ideological edifice, albeit without embracing monetarist economic theory. This conclusion further bolsters the idea proposed by this chapter that the ruse, and thus efficacy, of neoliberal ideology lies not in the foundational policy elements of the neoliberal project (in this instance, monetarism), but in the discursive practices and tropes utilised by neoliberal actors, be they intellectuals, commentators or policymakers. Neoliberal

ideology therefore operates not simply at a programmatic level, but at a linguistic one. This conclusion is strengthened when it is remembered that the junta itself abandoned certain policies closely associated with monetarism in response to the crisis of 1982 and did not re-adopt these policies when the crisis had been resolved (Hira 1998). This adds further credence to the notion that a particular suite of economic policies is not what defines neoliberalism.

vii. Concluding remarks

This chapter marks the end of the analysis of the source material in this research project and is the penultimate one of this thesis, preceding the conclusion. This chapter is dedicated to analysing the coverage of the Chilean economy published in the principal source material of this project (articles published in British left-wing newspapers and journals). As such, this chapter focusses on how the British Left analysed Chilean economic issues between 1970 and 1999, and how that analysis may have changed in the wake of important economic processes in the UK and in Chile. The chapter is divided according to chronology, in-keeping with the previous analysis chapters, which allows for a tracking of any said analytical changes. It is noted in subsection ii that following the election of Salvador Allende in 1970 to the Chilean presidency, the British Left uniformly interpreted developments in Chile's economy through what can be described as an archetypal Marxian economic framework. Structural concepts such as class conflict and imperialism were at the forefront of this analysis, contributing to what can be best described as a universal adherence to and application of Marx's historical materialism. This is despite the programmatic and strategic differences of the various left-wing groups operating in Britain at this time. In subsection iii it is found that this form of analysis hardened in the wake of the 1973 coup, the economic chaos that preceded the coup, and the economic policy changes brought in by the incoming junta. The Left demonstrated an adept understanding of the economic bases to the military coup at this time, as publications focussed squarely on purposeful acts of economic sabotage by the Chilean business community, multinational corporations, and the White House, and on the economic liberalisation policies being implemented by the junta. The publications of the Left interpreted, without exception, these processes as being driven by class interests.

It is found, however, in subsection iv that this strict adherence to Marxian economic theory began to waver at the close of the 1970s and onset of the 1980s. At this time the monetarist economic project was in full effect in Chile, while in the UK it was just beginning. In light of this, the Left's economic analyses exhibited subtle changes. Issues of class and imperialism became muddied with more 'moderate' terms of reference. Inflation became a primary economic concern for these publications, whereas it had not been before. This reflects the public debates that were ongoing in the UK around the time of the 1979 general election and the broader theoretical debates that had been ongoing for much longer between Keynesian and monetarist economists. Furthermore, the analysis from the Left became much more concerned with policy, as writers introduced a new concept that was unseen in Left publications in the early 1970s: that there are good and bad policies within capitalist economics. Class and imperialism are still discussed at this time but are contextualised and explained through policy rather than understood as integral features of the capitalist economic system. By the mid 1980s (discussed in subsection v) these vestiges of Marxian economic theory are abandoned by Leftist publications and policy concerns are brought to the forefront. Overall, what is demonstrated by the Left is a complete depoliticisation of the

economy and key economic actors (such as domestic and foreign corporations and investors), while the class conflict is displaced onto policymaking. While the Left never at any point in the 1980s evidences an acceptance of monetarism (all articles analysed argue against monetarist economics), the language used to argue against the monetarist project is that which is commonly used in Keynesian, post-Keynesian and Neo-Marxian economic traditions ('policy' rather than 'class', 'foreign investors' rather than 'economic imperialism'). It is concluded that this shift in analysis is in-keeping with existing CPE approaches to neoliberalism. The Left evidences an embracing of the scientific positivism that is fundamental to neoliberal economics. Furthermore, the emphasis on good versus bad policy highlights the re-articulation of economic actors as rational agents who can make correct and incorrect decisions. These existing insights are combined with the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis utilised throughout this thesis to conclude that this growing positivism within the Left's economic analyses reflects the broader discursive transference around key concepts that is inherent to neoliberal ideology. Economics is now imbued with the discourse of the University, as is the case with the state (chapter five) and the law (chapter six). This means that, as the Left resolutely refuses to embrace monetarist economic policy, the efficacy of neoliberal ideology lies not in particular economic agendas but in linguistics itself – the language of neoliberalism.

This conclusion is further bolstered by the source material drawn from the 1990s, which is discussed in subsection vi. Two articles cited and discussed exhibit the same depoliticisation of the economy and the same application of more 'orthodox' economic analysis. However, this tranche of source material throws up another interesting trend. In the 1990s there appears a re-emergence of more 'archetypal' Marxian economic analysis. The majority of the articles written during this time are reflective pieces insofar as they look back at Chile's experiences under Allende and under Pinochet. In these articles, Marxian terms such as 'imperialism' and 'class' re-appear, and such articles would not have looked out of place had they been published 25 years earlier. Yet in articles that discuss contemporary Chilean economics, the analysis is much more 'orthodox', and less 'Marxian'. A secondary, more tentative conclusion offered by this chapter, therefore, is that the Left (or rather, what remained of the Left following the end of the Cold War) was still comfortable applying Marxian analysis to moments in history, but not when analysing contemporary economics. The suggestion is that the Left has accepted that Marxian economics is at best a historical lens and not an appropriate analytical framework for the neoliberal world. Of course, it is important not to overstate this conclusion as a concrete fact, for the available material under analysis is too sparse to make such a claim in definitive terms. Therefore, this conclusion merely opens up a space for further studies that follow this line of inquiry.

8. Conclusions, reflections and avenues for future study

i. Introduction

This thesis reflects a complex research project dedicated to a critical (re-)interpretation of contemporary capitalism (identified as "neoliberalism" in this project). Located within a broader re-emergence and re-popularisation of Marxist approaches to capitalism in political economy, this thesis blends existing critical inquiries into neoliberalism with Slavoj Žižek's use of Lacanian psychoanalysis in critical theory to conceptualise neoliberalism as more than just a modality of governance, jurisprudence or economic policy – to conceptualise neoliberalism as an ideology that has both material effects and effects on subjectivity. This concluding chapter brings together the conclusions of the analysis section of this thesis and addresses the three overarching research questions that are established in chapter one. These questions are: 1) How does neoliberal ideology function?; 2) How does this ideology-function of neoliberalism differ to that form of capitalism which preceded it?; 3) To what extent, if any, did oppositional voices submit to neoliberal ideology?. On top of this, chapter one also established areas in which this thesis can provide academic study to plug various gaps in existing literatures. These include a robust methodology through which Žižek's Lacanian-founded ideology critique can be applied to political analysis; and a historical analysis of the neoliberal turn from below (i.e. outside of official institutions), from the the perspective of left-wing anti-capitalist groups.

To explore the above concepts, a complex body of case studies was constructed (in chapter two). Firstly, a test-case of non-institutional right-wing voices that were supportive of the neoliberal turn was crafted by looking at the evolution of *The Economist*'s coverage of the 'Chilean miracle' (established by this thesis as the first time when neoliberalism was instituted in a country). The primary source material with which this project is concerned – the coverage of the 'Chilean miracle' in newspaper and journal articles published by British left-wing anti-capitalist groups – is then contrasted with the findings of the right-wing test-case, providing an insight into the functioning of neoliberal ideology from below. The analysis of the material, both Right and Left, is undertaken through a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis (crafted in chapter three) which is then mediated through three established critical approaches to neoliberalism: neoliberalism as governance and governmentality; neoliberalism as jurisprudence; and neoliberalism as political economy. These three approaches are explored and reviewed in chapter one. As such, this concluding chapter is organised accordingly: sections ii, iii, iv and v summarise the findings of each of the analysis chapters respectively. Section vi then brings these conclusions together and directs them towards resolving the aforementioned research questions and gaps in the literatures to which this thesis is also addressed. Section vii outlines further areas of academic study that are opened up by this thesis. This chapter (and therefore this thesis) concludes with some final remarks in section viii.

ii. Support for the neoliberal turn from non-institutional voices: findings from *The Economist* test-case

Utilising *The Economist* as a test-case for non-institutional right-wing support for the neoliberal turn provides some fruitful and insightful results into a study of neoliberalism. First

and foremost, this study is the first to explore and critically analyse *The Economist*'s vast archive. As is set out in chapter two, despite this publication's long and storied history, it has since evaded much, if any, robust academic scrutiny. In this analysis several themes emerge. It is first noted that there is a stark difference between the form of *The Economist*'s coverage of Chilean political and economic affairs before and after the 1973 coup. Prior to the coup, the newsmagazine's overwhelmingly critical coverage of the UP government (1970-1973) evidences a politicisation of the Chilean state. The blame for all of Chile's woes is laid squarely at the door of the Allende regime. Post-coup, however, the state is immediately depoliticised, and politics and economics are delineated. The incoming junta, of which *The Economist* is very supportive, is portrayed as technocratic, dispassionate and apolitical, thereby articulating the coup and the suspension of democracy as a necessity to save Chile from its own politics. The violence of the junta is eventually decried and lamented by *The Economist*, though that violence is portrayed as an eccentricity of Latin American politics, while the neoliberal economic platform of the junta is articulated as a scientific necessity, a remedy for Chile's economic ailments. This upholds the existing CPE literature on neoliberalism which uncovers and stresses the inherent positivism of neoliberalism. Mediated through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, which is utilised throughout this thesis, this positivism is read as an act of discursive transference. The state goes from embodying the discourse of power (the Master), which is able to directly and resolutely affect and shape Chilean socio-political and economic relations, to one which is there to simply manage affairs through prudent policymaking.

This is also perceptible in *The Economist*'s changing analysis of permutations in Chile's legal institutions. Whereas prior to the 1973 coup, Chile's legal frameworks are interpreted as being political tools manipulated (and sometimes flaunted, allegedly) by the UP government, the ratification of the junta's own 1980 constitution evidences a strict depoliticisation of legal structures. The new constitution evades any critique from *The Economist*, sealing it off from contestation and giving the impression that the new legal parameters established by it are not up for debate. This very much echoes existing jurisprudential (namely, "new constitutionalist") approaches to neoliberalism, whereby the neoliberal turn is characterised as a process bound up in a new approach to jurisprudence which entails promoting neoliberal legal institutions as if they are naturally occurring entities. Mediated again through a Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, the same act of discursive transference is evidenced: the law goes from embodying the discourse of the Master to the discourse of the University. This is further reinforced by *The Economist's* coverage of Pinochet's indictment for human rights abuses in the late 1990s, which is portrayed as a complex legal issue that can only be understood and discussed by practitioners of law.

A similar trend emerges with regards to the conceptualisation of the subject. Through this depoliticisation of the state, the Chilean subject itself is articulated as the entity of utmost mastery and power. This is particularly evident in the 1980s, by which time *The Economist* lauds Chile's neoliberalism as a remarkable reformulation of the social body as one characterised by rugged individualism. In the new neoliberal paradigm, the subject is free to exercise consumer choice, and that consumerism is portrayed as the utmost expression of liberty. Read through the governmentality approach to neoliberalism (set out in chapter one), this individualisation of the subject has a disciplining effect, and this is also perceptible in *The Economist*'s coverage. As organised dissent to the junta grew throughout the 1980s, that

opposition is blamed by the newsmagazine as hindering its own ambitions. Incidents of political violence by opponents, and the quarrelsome nature of the legally recognised opposition parties, are blamed for the junta's refusal to cede power. *The Economist* compels the subject to behave accordingly, lest it continue to suffer the egregious actions of the military regime. When read alongside this discourse analysis, this is interpreted as the same discursive transference described above. The state is stripped of its mastery and is instead imbued with the discourse of the University (that of truth, rationality and objectivity), while the subject itself is imbued with the discourse of the Master previously embodied by the state.

The findings of chapter four, therefore, throw up two preliminary conclusions. Firstly, the rapid discursive transference and depoliticisation of institutions and actors immediately after the coup indicates that the foundation, entrenchment and solidification of the neoliberal turn relied not on institutional acts, but on non-institutional support. In other words, the neoliberal turn at the institutional level was preceded by a neoliberal turn at a non-institutional level, through supporting voices such as *The Economist*. Given that *The Economist* only serves as a test-case against which the primary source material with which this thesis is concerned (newspapers and journals of the British Left), this conclusion cannot be stated as a resolute certainty. Therefore, this opens up the scope for further study according to this finding, which is expanded upon in section vii of this chapter. Secondly, it can be preliminarily concluded that that seemingly distinct understandings of neoliberalism (as governance, jurisprudence and political economy) actually share a core underpinning grounded in changes in political discourse. This lends support to this thesis' overarching claim that neoliberalism is a linguistically structured ideology that affects governance, jurisprudence, economics as well as subjectivity. This point is explored further in the remaining analysis chapters.

iii. Neoliberalism and its effects on subjectivity: governance, governmentality and ideology

Having established the findings of the test-case, this thesis proceeds to the analysis of the primary source material with which this project is concerned: articles covering Chile that were published in British left-wing newspapers and articles between 1970 and 1999. This analysis begins in chapter five, in which the source material is analysed through the existing governmentality critique of neoliberalism, and this analysis is mediated through a discourse analysis founded upon Žižek's Lacanian-based ideology critique. The analysis ascertains several findings. Firstly, in the early 1970s, the British Left interpreted the state and state governance as inherently political. The state, its institutions and its actors are all read through a rudimentary Marxist state theory, whereby they are all interpreted as structures put in place to support and advance bourgeois capitalist interests. The coup itself is also read as a political act with the motivation being to further entrench capitalism within Chile. The politicisation of the state is in-keeping with the coverage of *The Economist*. While, of course, *The Economist* does not read the Chilean state as being bound up in capitalist interests, the newsmagazine does interpret it as being a political construct that has the power to directly affect socio-political and economic relations.

The difference, however, between the analysis on the Left and the analysis on the Right, is that the Left maintains this politicisation throughout the 1970s, even after the coup has occurred. This contrasts with *The Economist*, which immediately embarked upon a re-articulation of the state as an apolitical entity. The Left, however, soon follows the discursive act of depoliticisation around the beginning of the 1980s. Marxist state theory slowly begins to evaporate from the pages of left-wing publications. This is particularly noticeable in articles that cover political violence from anti-junta actors, which is decried in a similar manner to that by *The Economist*. The implication is that the Left is, by this time, acceding to neoliberal tropes. The governmentality approach informs that, in decrying such acts, the Left is exhibiting this same expression of subjectivity as the Right. The continuation of junta rule is the direct result of bad decisions by opposition actors. Subjected to this thesis' discourse analysis, the Left begins to exhibit the same discursive transference as the Right, albeit at a later date. A preliminary conclusion offered here is that the British Left only began to succumb to neoliberal tropes when the neoliberal turn was instituted in its own context, i.e. following the election of Margaret Thatcher in 1979. This conclusion is reflected upon in the proceeding chapters.

This process, however, is not uniform across the Left in the 1980s, and, at times, Marxist state theory does resurface. Yet this does not occur according to political divisions among the Left. In other words, it is not a case of some groups maintaining their Marxism while others not. Indeed, publications appear to flip between Marxist state theory and depoliticised analysis. This vindicates this thesis' decision to study the British Left as a semi-homogenous bloc. The process of depoliticisation becomes more resolute in the 1990s, and it is concluded that, by this time, neoliberalism has "won", insofar as the neoliberal turn has been instituted as the predominant hegemonic force in both Chile and the United Kingdom. As such, the Left near-fully accedes to neoliberal tropes, including the depoliticisation of the state and (re)articulation of the subject as the supreme individual of rationality, agency and mastery. This is noticeable in the Left's coverage of Chile's democratic transition in the early 1990s. The new liberal-democratic orientation of the country is exalted in such a way that liberal democracy is articulated as the "only way" or "correct way" of organising society, for it permits the exercising of individual choice and liberty through the ballot box. This echoes *The Economist*'s exaltation of consumer choice as the highest plain of liberty. Consumer choice is now being enacted through political choice (in elections). This not only supports the governmentality critique of neoliberalism, but further endorses this thesis' Lacaninan-inspired discourse analysis, as liberal democracy, and the transition that led to it in Chile, are imbued with the discourse of the University.

Another element of this discourse analysis is introduced here: the processes of particularisation and false universalisation. The Chilean transition escapes critical inquiry from the British Left and is instead portrayed as if it were a struggle innate to the human condition. The particular struggle for civil rights is falsely universalised as a totalising struggle. The transition is separated from the neoliberal context from which it was born. This falls in line with Žižek's critique of the post-Cold War Left in the West, in which he decries this particularisation/false universalisation and blames it for the Left's continual failure (explored in chapter three). This conclusion is carried forward in the proceeding analysis chapters. There are exceptions, however, and these are noted to be two groups that have managed to outlive their Leftist contemporaries: the SWP and RCG. It is surmised that these groups' continual

existence may, in part, be explained by their ability to maintain a politicised interpretation of state structures, and thus maintaining a certain political relevancy as Marxist organisations. The sample size, however, is too small to state this conclusion as fact, and this is another preliminary conclusion that invites further study in this area (further expanded upon in section vii).

iv. Neoliberalism and jurisprudence: *grundnorm,* new constitutionalism and ideology

In chapter six, this thesis builds on the analysis of the preceding one by focusing on Leftist coverage of permutations in Chile's legal frameworks throughout the 1970-1999 period. The analysis uncovers strikingly similar conclusions to those summarised above. In the 1970s, the British Left examined Chilean legal matters through a patently Marxist legal theory. Parallels are drawn with pre-eminent Marxist jurist Evgeny Pashukanis (whose work is offered as an example of Marxist legal theory). The British Left interprets Chile's legal structures and frameworks as entities that give basis to a capitalist state. Chile's constitution (that being the 1925 constitution, which was in place until 1980) and laws are viewed critically, as artefacts designed to uphold Chilean capitalism and entrench and support bourgeois interests at the expense of the working class. Despite the strategic and organisational differences between the various British Left groups under analysis, the deployment of Marxist legal theory is uniform across these groups in the 1970s. While one group, the CPGB, is more sympathetic to the UP government and its aims, even in its publications this group evidences an acute awareness of the political underpinnings to Chile's legal foundations. This critical evaluation of the concept of law sharpens throughout the 1970s as the junta replaces the UP government in 1973. This politicisation of legal frameworks by the Left during this period is very much in-keeping with the trend noted in the previous analysis chapter.

In-keeping with the findings of the previous chapter, this Marxist interpretation softens in the 1980s. Following the ratification of the junta's 1980 constitution, what is first noted is a softening of analysis by the CPGB's publications. The analysis becomes more "legalistic", as reportage on the new constitution takes on a much more apolitical tone. The constitution evades critical evaluation in the party's newspaper (*Morning Star*) and theoretical journal (*Marxism Today*), and the coverage belies a creeping legal positivism. This supports the critical jurisprudential approach to neoliberalism that reads the neoliberal turn as being underpinned by the (re)articulation of legal structures as natural laws that evade critique (labelled "new constitutionalism"). Read in conjunction with the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, the same process of discursive transference noted above, is once again evident: legal structures are stripped of their political capacity and imbued with objectivity – the discourse of the University. What emerges, therefore, is further evidence that neoliberalism is an ideology founded upon discursive acts, which, through the linguistic process of depoliticisation, has effects on modalities of governance and subjectivity (chapter five) *and* material effects on jurisprudence and legal structures. This also supports the conclusion that the British Left only begins to accede to neoliberal ideology in the early 1980s, once the neoliberal turn is instituted on home turf, as it were.

This process of depoliticisation begins to spread throughout the rest of the Left as the 1980s progress and becomes commonplace in the 1990s. This is evident in Leftist coverage of the

junta's continual use of state-sanctioned violence, particularly in the wake of Pinochet's indictment in the late 1990s. Whereas the violent act of the coup was interpreted by the British Left in the 1970s as bound up in national and international class politics, the use of violence by the junta is interpreted by the vestiges of the Left in the 1990s as being a simple, lamentable case of human rights abuses. The perpetrators' acts are stripped of their context. This furthers the conclusion that, in submitting to neoliberal ideology, the Left particularises issues. State violence is not an expression of class politics and bourgeois domination but is articulated as an issue in and of itself. This is even found in the publications of the two groups studied in this project that outlive their Leftist contemporaries – the SWP and the RCG. This means the preliminary conclusion suggested in the previous analysis chapter – that these groups' continual existence may, in part, be explained by their maintenance of Marxist political analysis – is brought into doubt.

v. Neoliberalism and political economy: economics, scientific positivism, rationalism and ideology

The final analysis chapter (seven) focusses on British Leftist coverage of developments in Chile's economy and economic policy. Once again, the analysis of the material from the 1970s throws up similar findings to those uncovered in chapters five and six. The British Left uniformly interprets Chilean economic affairs through what is described as an archetypal Marxian economic framework. Structural concepts such as class conflict and imperialism are placed at the forefront of Leftist economic analysis. The economic woes suffered during the Allende-led UP government (1970-1973) are adeptly perceived as being the result of purposeful economic warfare waged by capitalist interests (the Chilean bourgeoisie and its US allies). This analysis hardens after the coup, once more supporting the conclusion that, in contrast to the British Right, the British Left maintained a politicised interpretation of economics even after the neoliberal turn had begun in earnest in Chile. Indeed, the radical free market economic policies enacted by the junta in the mid-1970s are adeptly understood as being driven by class interests.

This politicisation wavers in the 1980s, reflecting the beginning of the neoliberal turn in the United Kingdom. Issues such as class and imperialism are removed from Leftist coverage and replaced with more "economistic" concerns, such as inflation. The coverage becomes much more "orthodox", insofar as it utilises language that is more familiar in mainstream, non-Marxian economic traditions. By the mid-1980s, a new frame of analysis is introduced by the Left: the concept that there is such a thing as good and bad economic policy. This marks an extraordinary shift in economic analysis by the Left. Gone are wholly critical discussions *about* capitalism; in their place, discussions *within* capitalism emerge. There is now a "right" and a "wrong" way to manage the economy. In the first instance, this clearly supports CPE understandings of neoliberalism, which maintain that the neoliberal turn has brought scientific positivism to the field of economics. Read alongside this thesis' Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis, the same process of discursive transference occurs. The economy, and its management, is now imbued with the discourse of the University. Economic matters are now appraised without consideration for their political capacity, as if the economy itself were a natural science. This very much falls in line with the findings of the previous chapters: that neoliberal ideology rests upon the depoliticisation of social fields, which itself is a process

driven at the linguistic level. This process becomes uniform among the vestiges of the British Left in the 1990s, also in-keeping with the findings of the previous chapters.

What is different about the findings of chapter seven, however, is that, when it comes to economic matters, the Left never appears to support monetarist economics. It is established by this thesis that, by the 1990s, the British Left seems to implicitly subscribe to the neoliberal tropes of depoliticisation (of both the state and its legal foundations) and individualisation of the subject. However, at no point in the material analysed does any section of the Left openly embrace monetarist economic policies. That is not to say, however, that the Left has not acceded to an understanding of economics that falls in line with neoliberal ideology. Despite not embracing monetarism, the Left still accedes to the neoliberal terms of reference around which economic matters are discussed and understood. Class conflict is displaced onto public policy and the bourgeoisie is re-articulated as a collection of individual rational actors. While the Left remains in opposition to neoliberal economics, the language it uses reflects a much more orthodox approach, at times even echoing Keynesianism. It is too much of a leap to suggest that the Left came to embrace Keynesian economic theory (the material does not support such a conclusion), but what can be concluded is that by simply accepting the terms of the debate ('policy' rather than 'class struggle', for example), the Left nonetheless evidences a succumbing to neoliberal tropes. This not only supports CPE understandings of neoliberalism (which suggest that neoliberalism is a project founded upon scientific positivism in the field of economics), but also supports this thesis' interpretation of neoliberalism as an ideology.

One final conclusion made in this chapter concerns those Left groups who continue to exist beyond the end of the Cold War: the SWP and the RCG. The analysis finds that the SWP withstands and rejects the scientific positivism to which other groups end up subscribing. This adds credence to the idea that this group's survival post-1990 must be read alongside the fact that it continues to offer an overtly Marxist interpretation of politics and economics, meaning it retains a certain relevancy and credibility as a left-wing anti-capitalist group. The RCG, however, is a more complex case. The material drawn from its newspaper that is studied in this chapter shows a dualism in its economic analyses. When revisiting the UP government and the 1973 coup, the paper mobilises an archetypal Marxian economic analysis, one which would not have looked out of place had it been published in the 1970s. However, when analysing contemporary issues, it evidences the same accession to neoliberal economic positivism. This leads to a further preliminary conclusion: when looking at past historical processes, the group sees Marxian economic theory as a useful tool, however, when considering contemporary issues, it does not. Again, the sample size is too small to claim this as a concrete certainty, but it is still worthy of reflection.

vi. Resolving the research questions: neoliberalism as ideology

Having summarised the conclusions of this thesis' analyses, the research questions that were established in chapter one can be revisited and addressed.

1. <u>How does neoliberal ideology function?</u>

Firstly, the critical conceptualisation of neoliberalism as an ideology, as offered by this thesis, is a useful and valid one. Existing critical interpretations of neoliberalism – which this thesis divides into three groups as governmentality, jurisprudence and CPE – appear to offer conflicting insights about the neoliberal turn. However, conceptualising neoliberalism as an ideology, building off Žižek's Lacanian-founded ideology critique, allows for a suturing together of these three competing perspectives. Governmentality, jurisprudence and CPE are all found to be valid evaluations of neoliberalism by this thesis. The analysis offered by this thesis demonstrates that neoliberalism does re-articulate the subject as an individual severed by common bonds and bounded by its own sense of individual power (à la governmentality). It also finds that neoliberalism has material effects. Legal structures are recast as irrefutable, naturally occurring entities that escape critique (à la new constitutionalism). Similarly, the field of economics as an academic discipline and as a realm of policymaking is recast as a natural science, one which carries the same positivism and certainty as physics, chemistry and biology (à la CPE). What unifies these perspectives is the insight of neoliberalism as ideology: neoliberalism is underpinned by language, in which a discursive transference occurs, serving to depoliticise multiple facets of the social field (the state, the law and the economy) while simultaneously rearticulating the subject as an individual ensnared by its own agency. Neoliberalism as ideology thereby transcends and unifies competing understandings of the concept. This approach also vindicates the utility of Žižek's ideology critique in political study. By constructing a methodology founded upon this critique, this research project has opened up a way of operationalising a complex development in contemporary critical theory.

2. <u>How does this ideology-function of neoliberalism differ to that form of capitalism which preceded it?</u>

This study demonstrates that the ideology-function of neoliberalism rests upon the process of depoliticisation, which itself is rooted in linguistic acts. The implication of this is that the form of capitalism which preceded the neoliberal turn did not operate along the same logic. The commonality that binds Right and Left discourse (evidenced by *The Economist* and the various British Left publications studied in this project respectively) is that, prior to the neoliberal turn, politicisation of the social field was manifest across the political spectrum. The Right and Left evinced politicised interpretations of institutions, actors and processes in different ways. Nonetheless, that process of politicisation was felt throughout. The ruse of neoliberalism is to strip the political capacity from institutions, actors and processes, sealing them off from critique and contestation. This acts to conceal the ideological foundation of neoliberalism and the institutions, actors and processes at the forefront of its manifestation. By articulating the edifices and actors that maintain neoliberalism as apolitical, they are portrayed as beyond questions of politics, and therefore are elevated beyond debate. Given the sample size of 'pre-neoliberal' material studied in this research project, this conclusion may be bolstered by future analysis (discussed in the following section).

3. <u>To what extent, if any, did oppositional voices submit to neoliberal ideology?</u>

This study has clearly demonstrated that oppositional voices to neoliberalism did in fact accede to the neoliberal ideological fantasy. This is uncovered through the analysis of British left-wing anti-capitalist newspaper and journal articles, which are taken by this thesis as representing the thinking of their associated groups. By the 1990s, the British Left is seen to

implicitly accept the neoliberal ruse of depoliticisation of the social field and individualization of the subject, and this is uncovered through the Lacanian-inspired discourse analysis developed and utilised throughout this thesis. This process is not universal, and some exceptions are found, namely in those groups that have survived following the end of the Cold War. These exceptions are discussed further in the following section. What is also noted on the Left are the connected processes of particularisation and false universalisation. Roughly, from the mid-1980s onwards, the Left appears to particularise certain issues, uncoupling them from the contexts in which these issues manifest. These issues include the proliferation of liberal democracy throughout the developing world (captured in this thesis by the Left's coverage of the Chilean transition in the early 1990s) and the codification and legal protection of human rights (captured in this thesis by the Left's coverage of Pinochet's indictment in the late 1990s). These issues are removed from their contexts and subsequently universalised as struggles innate to the human condition. This falls in line with Žižek's criticism of the post-Cold War Left in the West, which he criticises for engaging in this particularisation/false universalisation process that he views as part and parcel of contemporary capitalist ideology (explored in chapter three). This is also discussed further in the following section. Finally, in answering this question through the analysis conducted in chapters five to seven, this thesis provides a much-needed history of neoliberalism through oppositional voices, establishing a view of neoliberalism from the "losers' perspective".

vii. Further avenues for exploration and analysis

This research is not all-encompassing and some of the conclusions could benefit from further academic study. Therefore, this thesis opens up further lines of inquiry. The first of these is uncovered in the analysis of *The Economist*. A preliminary conclusion reached in chapter four is that non-institutional supporting voices of the neoliberal turn, such as *The Economist*, may have adopted neoliberal ideological tropes prior to the institution of neoliberalism itself at an official-governmental level. In other words, non-institutional support preceded institutional support. It is well-known that actors and groups were advocating neoliberal policies long before the Pinochet-led Chilean junta, particularly in the United States (Mirowski & Plehwe 2009; Stedman Jones 2012). However, what this thesis establishes is the following question: to what extent did those actors/groups who were not directly involved in crafting neoliberal thought endorse neoliberal ideology, either explicitly or implicitly, prior to the establishment of neoliberal governments? To put it more simply, what was the role of the popular media in the neoliberal turn? The analysis of chapter four could be expanded to include other right-wing newspapers and magazines to see if contemporaries of *The Economist* followed the same ideological path in the same time frame. This opens up the possibility of examining whether neoliberalism was simply an intellectual-led project, or if it was driven, in part at least, by the popular media "on the ground", as it were.

While this thesis has addressed the second research question established in chapter one (see above), this conclusion that neoliberal ideology functions differently to pre-neoliberal capitalism could also benefit from further study. Future studies that expand the existing analysis, reaching back before 1970, would add to the source material available for analysis. Given the time-restricted nature of this research project, this was not possible in this instance. Nevertheless, the opportunity now exists to look back into the earlier years of the post-war consensus (identified by this thesis as the form of capitalism that preceded the neoliberal

turn) in order to establish whether the conclusions arrived at by this thesis can be bolstered and verified with greater academic integrity and scrutiny.

Finally, this thesis also provides scope for new critical evaluations of the British anti-capitalist Left. This thesis suggests (though does not claim with certainty) that one possible reason for the continual existence of some Left groups in the UK rests upon their adherence to, and mobilisation of, rudimentary aspects of Marxist political and economic theory, thus giving these groups relevancy and credibility as left-wing anti-capitalist groups. Once more, the limited sample size of the source material analysed does not allow for this thesis to claim this with surety, however it does invite any future studies of the British Left to take this insight into consideration. Furthermore, it is also suggested that the findings of this thesis may lend support to Žižek's claim that the post-Cold War Left in the West has failed to make any credible advances to their cause because the Left has fallen into the trap of particularisation/false universalisation. Again, this thesis cannot claim this with certainty, however the findings do lend itself to Žižek's claim, and so further critical inquiry and evaluation is invited. This conclusion also appears to support the work of Jodi Dean, who has made a similar criticism of the Left in recent times. While she does not use the same terms as Žižek, she does maintain that the Left has succumbed to capitalist ideological constructs such as individualisation (Dean 2012, 2016). Therefore, the findings of this thesis do echo critical interventions by certain critical theorists on socialist strategy.

There are various ways such research could be undertaken. As some of the source material utilised in this research is rather thin (owing to the lack of relevant articles published during particular timeframes, particularly between the mid-1980s and late 1990s), this research project could be replicated by looking at similar experiences to the Chilean one. Possible options include looking at Left coverage of the Portuguese 'Estado Novo' or Francoist Spain. Both dictatorships replaced relatively vibrant and left-leaning liberal democracies and undertook a radical transformation of the Portuguese and Spanish social bodies (Gallagher 1979; Richards 2002; Ruiz 2005; Ribeiro de Meneses 2010). While they may not have been patently 'neoliberal' regimes, as was the case in Chile, they did quash left-wing dissent and further entrench capitalist domination in those countries (Baklanoff 1979; Baklanoff 1992; Lieberman 1995; Aceña & Ruiz 2007). Another possibility would be to replicate the analysis for Left coverage of domestic issues, in order to compare and contrast how the British Left conceptualised the neoliberal turn abroad (i.e. in Chile) versus their conceptualisation of the same processes at home (particularly under Thatcher).

viii. Final remarks

Despite some shortcomings in the analysis and findings of this research, this project has ultimately added vital knowledge and understanding in the critical interpretation of neoliberal capitalism. First and foremost, from a methodological standpoint, this research offers up a way of operationalising the burgeoning Lacano-Marxist field in political study, something which, up until this point, was yet to be done. With regards to additions to the field of political philosophy and critical theory, by conceptualising neoliberalism as an ideology it is possible to understand how the neoliberal turn has had major concrete effects on policymaking (particularly in the realm of economic policy) and on juridical matters, while at the same time also having major effects on how subjects are conceptualised by institutions,

thus having an effect on their behaviour. Viewing neoliberalism as an edifice structured by discourse demonstrates how the depoliticisation of state institutions and their actors is ensured. The re-conceptualisation of the subject as an individual entity exercising power through choice is achieved by transposing the discourse of power from the state onto the subject itself. The effect of this manipulation of discourse is to close off critique and debate. By changing the way in which both institutions and subjects are discussed, and conceptualised, well-established critiques of the capitalist system are rendered insufficient. Critique is therefore nullified. This is compounded by the process of particularisation of political issues. It is not just subjects that are individualised, but the issues faced by subjects receive the same treatment. Political struggles, such as the struggle for democracy and civil rights, are separated from the overarching structure that makes them struggles in the first place – capitalism.

The burning question now is how to conceptualise and articulate a radical, emancipatory, anti-capitalist politics that is able to withstand the surrender to capitalist fantasies. While answering this question is not the focus of this research, it is still worthwhile offering some ruminations on this topic in light of the conclusions reached by this thesis. It has been noted in this thesis that the "figurehead" (such that he is) of the Lacano-Marxist tradition, Slavoj Žižek, offers little in the way of a concrete roadmap ahead for the radical Left. Those who utilise Lacanian theory in political and cultural analysis are charged with crafting their own interpretation of what the future of radical politics should look like. Jodi Dean has contributed immensely to this question. As she states, 'a political theory informed by recent work in psychoanalysis (primarily Žižek's Lacanian Marxism) is one way to…contribute to the project of politicising the Left' (2009: 16). She does so by utilising Lacanian theory to breathe new life into the idea of a communist project and the communist party as the vehicle for emancipation (Dean 2012; 2016). Another who has sought to bridge the gap between Lacanian theory and political praxis is Saul Newman, who takes Lacanian theory in a different direction to that of Dean and seeks to synthesize it with anarchism, crafting in the process what he labels 'postanarchism' (2001: 157).

Without delving into the benefits and/or weaknesses of either of these positions, what is clear from this research and the broader Lacano-Marxist tradition within which it sits, is that future emancipatory projects must find a political articulation of traversing the capitalist fantasy. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, successful treatment is only achieved when both analyst and analysand (the patient under analysis) are able to 'traverse the fantasy' that underpins the analysand's affliction. Ultimately, the patient must come to terms with and accept how their fantasies structure their subjective reality:

> 'This traversal allows the subject to grope with the structural ramifications of fantasy: how the formation of fantasy disguises symbolic inconsistencies in the Other and covers over the multifarious voids in the Other which undermine its authority and call into question its very existence' (Feldstein 1994: 157)

Thus, the question with which the Left must grapple as a point of priority is how to stage the encounter with the fantasies that underpin its current orientation. This thesis echoes the calls of Dean, Newman and Žižek that contemporary Leftists must return to the fundamental concept of radical anti-capitalism and articulate a politics that transcends binary divisions of

welfare state versus privatisation, liberal democracy versus authoritarianism, multiculturalism versus white supremacy. These causes are important, but they are not absolutes. They are not ends in themselves. What is needed now more than ever is a radicalism that crafts new fantasies, universalist fantasies that demand a complete reorientation of both the Symbolic and the subjectivities crafted in it. To return to the Hegelian 'negation of negation,' a political project is needed whose end goal is not simply the end of capitalism, but the end of the need for a Left as we know it. What is needed is a truly Lacanian communism, a Lacano-Communist project.

Bibliography

Aceña, Pablo Martín & Elena Martínez Ruiz (2007) 'The Golden Age of Spanish Capitalism: Economic Growth without Political Freedom' in Nigel Towson (ed.) *Spain Transformed: The Franco Dictatorship, 1959-1975* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan: 30-46

Acuña, Rodrigo (2015) 'From Allende to the Pink Tide: Issues Past and Present with the Left in Power' *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research* 21(3): 405-416

Aguilera, Pilar & Ricardo Fredes (eds.) (2006) *Chile: The Other September 11: An Anthology of Reflections on the 1973 Coup* North Melbourne: Ocean Press

Ahmed, Ishtiaq (1991) *The Concept of an Islamic State in Pakistan: An Analysis of Ideological Controversies* Lahore: Vanguard Books

Aksikas, Jafaar & Sean Johnson Andrews (2014) 'Neoliberalism, Law and Culture: A Cultural Studies Intervention after "the Juridical Turn"' *Cultural Studies* 28(5-6): 742-780

Alcorn, Marshall W. (2002) *Changing the Subject in English Class: Discourse and the Constructions of Desires* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press

Alexander, Robert J. (1991) *International Trotskyism, 1929-1985: A Documented Analysis of the Movement* Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Althusser, Louis (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* London: New Left Books: 121-173

Ambrose, Mike (March 25th, 1999) 'Pinochet Stays to Face Extradition' *Morning Star*: 6

Ambrose, Mike & Chris Kasrils (October 19th, 1998) 'Pinochet Must Face the Music' *Morning Star*: 1

Amorós, Mario (2008) 'Salvador Allende: Un Revolucionario para el Siglo XXI' *Pasajes: Revista de Pensamiento Contemporáneo* 27: 109-115

apple.com (October 18th, 2010) 'Apple Reports Fourth Quarter Results' [online] URL: https://www.apple.com/uk/newsroom/2010/10/18Apple-Reports-Fourth-Quarter-Results/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Arestis, Philip & Malcolm Sawyer (2005) 'The Neoliberal Experience in the United Kingdom' in Saad-Filho, Alfredo & Deborah Johnston (eds.) *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader* London: Pluto Press: 199-207

Atiles-Osoria, José (2013) 'Neoliberalism, Law and Strikes: Law as an Instrument of Repression at the University of Puerto Rico, 2010-2011' *Latin American Perspectives* 40(5): 105-117

Baklanoff, Eric N. (1979) 'The Political Economy of Portugal's Old Regime: Growth and Change Preceding the 1974 Revolution' *World Development* 7(8-9): 799-811

Baklanoff, Eric N. (1992) 'The Political Economy of Portugal's Later "Estado Novo": A Critique of the Stagnation Thesis' *Luso-Brazilian Review* 29(1): 1-17

Bagguley, Paul (1995) 'Protest, Poverty and Power: A Case Study of the Anti-Poll Tax Movement' *Sociological Review* 43(4): 693-719

Balfour, Chris (November 2nd, 1974) 'Chile and the British Left' *Red Weekly*: 4-5

Ball, Stuart (2013) *A Chronology of the Heath Government* London: Routledge

Barandiarán, Edgardo & Leonardo Hernández (December 1999) 'Origins and Resolutions of a Banking Crisis: Chile 1982-1986' *Banco Central de Chile Documentos de Trabajo* Santiago de Chile: Banco Central de Chile

Barkan, Joshua (2018) 'Corporate Power and Neoliberalism' in Damien Cahill et al. (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* London: SAGE Publications: 446-456

Barros, Robert (2002) *Constitutionalism and Dictatorship: Pinochet, the Junta and the 1980 Constitution* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Barros, Ximina (March 9th, 1990) 'The Battle for Democracy' *Militant*: 10

Baruffati, David et al (2020) 'A Sick City in a Sick Country' in Keith Kintrea & Rebeca Madgin (eds.) *Transforming Glasgow: Beyond the Post-Industrial City* Bristol: Bristol University Press: 121-138

Barrow, Clyde W. (1993) *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press

Barrow, Clyde W. (2000) 'The Marx Problem in Marxian State Theory' *Science & Society* 64(1): 87-118

BBC News (November 25th 1998) 'Thatcher Urges Pinochet Release' [online] URL: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/221935.stm [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

BBC News (March 26th 1999) 'Thatcher Stands by Pinochet' [online] URL: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/304516.stm [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Beauvais, Jean-Pierre (May 10th, 1971) 'After the April Municipal Elections' *Intercontinental Press* 9(18): 432-434

Beauvais, Jean-Pierre (November 16th, 1973) 'Chile under the Generals' *Red Weekly*: 4-5

Beauvais, Jean-Pierre (February 18th, 1974) 'Junta Faces Mounting Difficulties' *Intercontinental Press* 12(6): 178-181

Beauvais, Jean-Pierre (March 1st, 1974) 'The Workers' Resistance in Chile' *Red Weekly*: 6

Beckett, Francis (1995) *Enemy Within: The Rise and Fall of the British Communist Party* London: John Murray

Beckett, Francis & David Hencke (2009) *Marching to the Fault Line: The 1984 Miners' Strike and the Death of Industrial Britain* London: Constable & Robinson Ltd.

Bellisario, Antonio (2007) 'The Chilean Agrarian Transformation: Agrarian Reform and Capitalist 'Partial' Counter-Agrarian Reform, 1964-180 – Part 1: Reformism, Socialism and Free-Market Neoliberalism' *Journal of Agrarian Change* 7(1): 1-34

Bellware, Kim (September 12th, 2019) 'There may have been dozens more deaths linked to the Flint water crisis than previously known' *The Washington Post* [online] URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2019/09/12/there-may-have-been-dozens-more-deaths-linked-flint-water-crisis-than-previously-disclosed/ [date last accessed 20/02/2020]

Benton, Greg (March 9th, 1973) 'Chilean Elections: Mobilise Workers to Defeat Reaction' *Militant*: 4

Bertonha, João Fábio (2015) 'Sobre Fascismos e Ditaduras: A Herença Fascista na Fomatação dos Regimes Militares do Brasil, Argentina e Chile' *Revista de História Comparada* 9(1): 203: 231

Bevir, Mark (2011) 'Governance and Governmentality after Neoliberalism' *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 39(4): 457-471

Bidet, Jacques (2016) *Foucault with Marx* London: Zed Books

Birchall, Ian (September 15th, 1979) 'Tories Dreamland' *Socialist Worker*: 7

Birchall, Ian (1980) 'The Autonomy of Theory: A Short History of *New Left Review*' *International Socialism* 2(10): 51-91

Birchall, Ian & Chris Harman (1973) 'Chile: End of the Parliamentary Road' *International Socialism* 1(62): 9-14

Blake, Robert (2012) *The Conservative Party from Peel to Major* London: Faber and Faber

Blinder, Alan S. (1988) 'The Fall and Rise of Keynesian Economics' *Economic Record* 64(4): 278-294

Blum, William (2004) *Killing Hope: US Military & CIA Interventions since World War II, Part 1* London: Zed Books

Boas, Taylor & Jordan Gans-Morse (2009) 'Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan' *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44(2): 137-161

Bober, Ed (September 5th 1980) 'Chile: The High Cost of Monetarism' *Militant*: 11

Boltanski, Luc & Eve Chiapello (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism* London: Verso

Bourdieu, Pierre et al (1991) *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Preliminaries* New York City, NY: Walter de Gruyter

Braunthal, Gerard (1999) 'The 1998 German Election: Gerhard Schröder and the Politics of the New Middle' *German Politics & Society* 17(1): 32-54

Breeze, Ruth (2011) 'Critical Discourse Analysis and its Critics' *Pragmatics* 214(4): 493-525

Bresnahan, Rosalind (2003) 'Chile since 1990: The Contradictions of Neoliberal Democratization' *Latin American Perspectives* 30(5): 3-15

Brown, B. J. & Sally Baker (2013) *Responsible Citizens: Individuals, Health and Policy under Neoliberalism* London: Anthem Press

Bruss, Neal (1981) 'Lacan & Literature: Imaginary Objects and Social Order' *The Massachussets Review* 22(1): 62-91

Bulman, May (September 3rd, 2019) 'Suicides rise to 16-year high across UK' *The Independent* [online] URL: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/suicide-uk-rise-deaths-mental-health-office-national-statistics-a9089631.html [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Burgin, Angus (2015) *The Great Persuasion: Reinventing Free Markets since the Great Depression* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University press

Burnham, Peter et al (2004) *Research Methods in Politics* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Burns, Danny (1992) *Poll Tax Rebellion* Stirling: AK Press

Burris, Beverly H. (1993) *Technocracy at Work* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Burton-Cartledge, Phil (2014) 'Marching Separately, Seldom Together: The Political History of Two Principal Trends in British Trotskyism, 1945-2009' in Evan Smith & Matthew Worley (eds.) *Against the Grain: The British Far Left From 1956* Manchester: Manchester University Press: 80-87

Butler, David & Dennis Kavanagh (1980) *The British General Election of 1979* London: Macmillan

Butler, Judith et al (2000) *Contingency, Hegemony Universality* London: Verso

Buttolph Johnson, Janet & H. T. Reynolds (2005) *Political Science Research Methods* Washington, D. C.: CQ Press

Cafruny, Alan & Magnus Ryner (2003) 'Introduction: The Study of European Integration in the Neoliberal Era' in Cafruny, Alan & Magnus Ryner (eds.) *A Ruined Fortress?: Neoliberal Hegemony and Transformation in Europe* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield: 1-16

Callaghan, John (1990) *Socialism in Britain since 1884* London: Wiley-Blackwell

Callaghan, John (2003) *Cold War, Crisis and Conflict: The History of the Communist Party of Great Britain, 1951-68* London: Lawrence & Wishart

Calvert, Peter (1994) *The International Politics of Latin America* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Campbell, John (2008) 'Edward Heath' *Contemporary Record* 2(2): 27-28

Cerny, Philip (2008) 'Embedding Neoliberalism: The Evolution of a Hegemonic Paradigm' *The Journal of International Trade and Diplomacy* 2(1): 1-46

Chick, Victoria & Sheila Dow (2013) 'Keynes, the Long Run and the Present Crisis' *International Journal of Political Economy* 42(1): 13-25

Childs, David (2001) *Britain Since 1945: A Political History* London: Routledge

Clark, Kate (September 11th, 1984) 'Chileans Take Up Right to Rebel' *Morning Star*: 2

Clarke, Simon (1988) 'Overaccumulation, Class Struggle and the Regulation Approach' *Capital & Class* 12(3): 59-92

Cliff, Tony (2000a) *Marxism at the Millenium* London: Bookmarks

Cliff, Tony (2000b) *A World to Win: Life of a Revolutionary* London: Bookmarks

Clough, Robert (August/September 1998) 'Chile: Lessons of the Coup' *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!*

Colectivo Diatriba (2011) 'Reflexiones sobre el Proyecto Político-Pedagógico del Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR) durante el Gobierno de la Unidad Popular, 1970-1973' *Revista Electrónica Diálogos Educativos* 21: 1-15

Collier, Simon & William Sater (2004) *A History of Chile, 1808-2002* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Conlan, Tara (September 13th, 2016) 'Ofcom TV chief to leave after five months amid row over outside work' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/sep/13/ofcom-tv-chief-bill-emmott [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Collins, John & Ross Glover (2002) *Collateral Language: A User's Guide to America's New War* New York City, NY: New York University Press

Connor, Steve (February 12th, 2015) 'Plastic waste in ocean to increase tenfold by 2020' *The Independent* [online] URL: https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/plastic-waste-in-ocean-to-increase-tenfold-by-2020-10042613.html [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Corby, Gerry (March 16th, 1974) 'Force Labour to Act on Chile' *Red Weekly*: 8

Corby, Gerry (June 13th, 1974) 'Allende Supporters Go on Trial' *Red Weekly*: 7

Corkill, David R. (1976) 'The Chilean Socialist Party and the Popular Front, 1933-41' *Journal of Contemporary History* 11(2/3): 261-273

Corrigan, Philip (1980) *Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory: Historical Investigations* London: Quartet

Coxhead, Sheila (October 1970) 'Chile: For a Real Workers' Government' *Militant*: 2

Clayton, Pierce (2013) *Education in the Age of Biocapitalism: Optimizing Educational Life for a Flat World* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Clough, Robert (August/September 1998) 'Chile: Lessons of the Coup' *Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism!*

Craven, Pat (March 1971) 'Chilean Crisis: Arm the Workers against Reaction' *Militant*: 2

Crines, Andrew Scott (2011) *Michael Foot and the Labour Leadership* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Critchley, Simon (1998) '"Das Ding": Lacan and Levinas' *Research in Phenomenology* 28: 72-90

Cross, Rich (2014) 'British Anarchism in the Era of Thatcherism' in Evan Smith & Matthew Worley (eds.) *Against the Grain: The British Far Left from 1956* Manchester: Manchester University Press: 133-153

Crow, Joanna (2007) 'Debates about Ethnicity, Class and Nation in Allende's Chile (1970-1973)' *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26(3): 319-338

Cullen, Bernard (1979) *Hegel's Social and Political Thought: An Introduction* Dublin: Gill & Macmillan

Dale, Gareth & Adam Fabry (2018) 'Neoliberalism in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union' in Damien Cahill et al. (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* London: SAGE Publications: 234-247

Davidson, Paul (2011) *Post-Keynesian Macroeconomic Theory, Second Edition: A Foundation for Successful Economic Policies for the Twenty-First Century* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing

De Castro, Sergio (1992) *El Ladrillo: Bases de la Política Económica del Gobierno Militar Chileno* Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos

De Long, J. Bradford (1997) 'America's Peacetime Inflation: The 1970s' in Christina D. Romer & David H. Romer (eds.) *Reducing Inflation: Motivation and Strategy* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press: 247-280

Dean, Jodi (2009) *Democracy and Other Neoliberal Fantasies: Communicative Capitalism and Left Politics* Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Dean, Jodi (2012) *The Communist Horizon* London: Verso

Dean, Jodi (2016) *Crowds and Party* London: Verso

Dean, Mitchell (2009) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* London: SAGE Publications

Dean, Mitchell (2018) 'Foucault and the Neoliberalism Controversy' in Damien Cahill et al. (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* London: SAGE Publications: 40-54

Denbow, Jennifer (2017) 'The Problem with *Hobby Lobby*: Neoliberal Jurisprudence and Neoconservative Values' *Feminist Legal Studies* 25(2): 165-184

Denny, Brian & Mike Ambrose (October 20th, 1998) 'Chile Leaders Urge Backing for Arrest' *Morning Star*: 6

Di Muzio, Tim (2018) 'Disciplinary Neoliberalism, the Tyranny of Debt and the 1%' in Damein Cahill et al. (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* London: SAGE Publications: 457-468

Dorey, Peter (1995) *The Conservative Party and the Trade Unions* London: Routledge

Dorfman, Ariel (2006) 'The Last September 11' in Pilar Aguilera & Ricardo Fredes (eds.) *Chile: The Other September 11: An Anthology of Reflections on the 1973 Coup* North Melbourne: Ocean Press

Drake, Paul (2003) 'The Labour Movement in Chile: From Popular Unity to Concertación' *Revista de Ciencia Política* 23(2): 148-158

Dromey, Joe (June 1st, 2018) 'Don't blame trade unions for their declining membership' *New Statesman* [online] URL: https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2018/06/don-t-blame-trade-unions-their-declining-membership [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Dudley Edwards, Ruth (1995) *The Pursuit of Reason: The Economist, 1843-1993* London: Hamish Hamilton

Duménil, Gérard & Dominique Lévy (2005) 'The Neoliberal (Counter-)Revolution' in Alfredo Saad-Filho & Deborah Johnston (eds.) *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader* London: Pluto Press: 9-19

Duran, Claudio (July 1971) 'The Chilean Road to Socialism' *Marxism Today*: 204-208

Durkheim, Émile (2007) *The Rules of Sociological Method [1895]* in Calhoun, Craig et al (eds.) *Classical Sociological Theory* Oxford: Blackwell: 139-157

Eaden, James & David Renton (2002) *The Communist Party of Great Britain since 1920* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Eatwell, John & Murray Milgate (2011) *The Fall and Rise of Keynesian Economics* Oxford: Oxford University Press

The Economist (September 5th, 1970) 'Chile: The Ends Against the Middle': 33-34

The Economist (November 7th, 1970) 'Leftward Ho!': 42

The Economist (November 21st, 1970) 'The Santiago Vigil': 14-15

The Economist (October 9th, 1971) 'Chile: The Copper War': 44

The Economist (March 10th, 1973) 'The Stalemated Revolution': 18-19

The Economist (September 15th, 1973) 'The End of Allende': 16-17

The Economist (September 22nd, 1973) 'The Second Vietnam?': 16-18

The Economist (September 22nd, 1973) 'Chile: The Fighting's Not Over Yet': 62

The Economist (September 29th, 1973) 'Chile: Chile's No Place for a Monolith': 45-46

The Economist (October 6th, 1973) 'Chile: Pepe Captured': 42-43

The Economist (October 27th, 1973) 'Chile: But China Stays': 64

The Economist (December 22nd, 1973) 'Chile: Bad Enough but Not That Bad': 37-38

The Economist (March 16th, 1974) 'Chile: Bone for the Left': 40

The Economist (April 20th, 1974) 'Morals in the Marketplace': 15

The Economist (September 14th, 1974) 'The Pinochet Way': 14

The Economist (September 14th, 1974) 'Fingers in the Chile Pie': 63-64

The Economist (July 19th, 1980) 'Chile: After Tomorrow': 40

The Economist (September 6th, 1980) 'Chile: A Vote Against Voting?': 32-33

The Economist (March 3rd, 1984) 'Chile: Unwelcome Guests': 54

The Economist (April 21st, 1984) 'Chile, Peru and Bolivia: Feeling the Heat': 37

The Economist (June 9th, 1984) 'Chile: Shy Terrorists': 48

The Economist (August 25th, 1984) 'Chile: Muddlers Don't Win': 38-39

The Economist (September 15th, 1984) 'Chile: Trapped': 51-52

The Economist (November 10th, 1984) 'Chile: Looking for a Way Out': 48

The Economist (November 24th, 1984) 'Pinochet Won't Go': 14

The Economist (March 30th, 1985) 'Chile: Getting Together at Last?': 66

The Economist (September 7th, 1985) 'Chile: A Real Opposition at Last': 54-55

The Economist (September 14th, 1985) 'Alternative to Pinochet': 16

The Economist (March 17th, 1990) 'The New Latin Beat': 19-20

The Economist (September 8th, 1990) 'Chile: Allende's Ghost': 96

The Economist (April 20th, 1991) 'Chile: Solid State': 72-73

The Economist (January 10th, 1998) 'Enough of Pinochet': 17

The Economist (March 7th, 1998) 'Chile: All Good Things Must Slow Down': 71-72

The Economist (October 31st, 1998) 'Chile: The Pinochet Backlash': 70

The Economist (November 21st, 1998) 'Chile: Human Rights? What are They?': 70-71

The Economist (March 27th, 1999) 'Britain: Not Much to Celebrate': 33-34

The Economist (March 27th, 1999) 'Chile: After the Pinochet Ruling': 72

The Economist (November 28th, 1999) 'Chile and Pinochet: Indignant, Up to a Point': 80

The Economist (December 18th, 1999) 'Chile's Centre-Left, Disconcerted in Victory': 51-52

The Economist (April 28th, 2005) 'There is no alternative (alas)' [online] URL: https://www.economist.com/leaders/2005/04/28/there-is-no-alternative-alas [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

The Economist (April 13th, 2013) 'Margaret Thatcher: Freedom Fighter' [online] URL: https://www.economist.com/leaders/2013/04/13/freedom-fighter [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Edwards, Jim (February 13th, 2017) 'An economic trend that ensured British prosperity for the last 136 years just went into reverse' *Business Insider* [online] URL: https://www.businessinsider.com/millennials-uk-first-generation-1800s-do-worse-than-parents-resolution-foundation-2017-2?r=US&IR=T [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Emirbayer, Mustafa (2003) *Émile Durkheim: Sociologist of Modernity* Oxford: Blackwell

Emmanuel, Arghiri (1979) 'The State and the Transition to Socialism' *New Left Review* 1(113-114): 111-131

Ensalaco, Mark (1999) *Chile under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press

Esch, Joanne (2010) 'Legitimizing the "War on Terror": Political Myth in Official-Level Rhetoric' *Political Psychology* 31(3): 357-391

Evans, Les (October 12th, 1970) 'Nixon Weighs Possible Alternatives to Allende' *Intercontinental Press* 8(33): 841-843

Evans, Rebecca (2006) 'Pinochet in London: Pinochet in Chile: International and Domestic Politics in Human Rights Policy' *Human Rights Quarterly* 28(1): 207-244

Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* London: Longman

Faúndez, Julio (1988) *Marxism and Democracy in Chile: From 1932 to the Fall of Allende* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Feldner, Heiko & Fabio Vighi (2007) 'Ideology Critique or Discourse Analysis? Žižek against Foucault' *European Journal of Political Theory* 6(2): 141-159

Feldner, Heiko & Fabio Vighi (2015) *Critical Theory and the Crisis of Contemporary Capitalism: Collapse without Salvation* London: Bloomsbury

Feldstein, Richard (1994) 'The Phallic Gaze of Wonderland' in Richard Feldstein et al (eds.) *Reading Seminar XI: Lacan's Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* New York City, NY: State University of New York Press: 149-174

Femia, Joseph (1981) *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness and the Revolutionary Process* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Fermandois, Joaquín (2013) *La Revolución Inconclusa: La Izquierda Chilena y el Gobierno de la Unidad Popular* Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos

Fernández, Adriela & Marisol Vera (2012) 'Introduction: The Bachelet Presidency and the End of Chile's Concertación Era' *Latin American Perspectives* 39(4): 5-18

Ffrench-Davis, Ricardo (2002) *Economic Reforms in Chile: From Dictatorship to Democracy* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press

Fiennes, Sophie (dir.) (2012) *The Pervert's Guide to Ideology* Toronto: P. Guide Productions; Zeitgeist Films

Fight Racism! Fight Imperialism! (September 19th, 2012) 'What We Stand For' [online] URL: http://www.revolutionarycommunist.org/about/what-we-stand-for [date last accessed: 13/03/2019]

Figueroa Clark, Victor (2015) 'The Forgotten History of the Chilean Transition: Armed Resistance against Pinochet and US Policy towards Chile in the 1980s' *Journal of Latin American Studies* 47(3): 491-520

Fink, Bruce (1997) *The Lacanian Subject: Between Language and Jouissance* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Finlayson, Alan (2004) 'Political Science, Political Ideas and Rhetoric' *Economy and Society* 33(4): 528-549

Finlayson, Alan (2007) 'From Beliefs to Arguments: Interpretive Methodology and Rhetorical Political Analysis' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9(4): 545-563

Finlayson, Alan (2008) '"It Ain't What you Say…": British Political Studies and the Analysis of Speech and Rhetoric' *British Politics* 3(4): 445-464

Fisher, Mark (2009) *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* London: Zero Books

Fleet, Michael (2014) *The Rise and Fall of Chilean Christian Democracy* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Foley, Gerry (October 15th, 1973) '"Pools of Blood" on Sidewalks of Santiago' *Intercontinental Press* 11(36): 1141-1144

Foucault, M (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Foucault, Michel (2017) *Subjectivity and Truth: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1980-81* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Fourcade-Gourinchas, Marion & Sarah Babb (2002) 'The Rebirth of the Liberal Creed: Paths to Neoliberalism in Four Countries' *American Journal of Sociology* 108(3): 533-579

Frazer, Jane (August 31st, 1973) 'The End for Allende?' *Red Weekly*: 7

Furci, Carmelo (1984) 'The Crisis of the Chilean Socialist Party (PSCh) in 1979' *ISA Working Papers* (11)

Gallagher, Tom (1979) 'Controlled Repression in Salazar's Portugal' *Journal of Contemporary History* 14(3): 385-402

Gallardo, Eduardo (November 26th, 2006) 'Pinochet Accepts Blame for Regime, Defends Military Coup' *The Seattle Times* [online] URL: https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/pinochet-accepts-blame-for-regime-defends-military-coup/ [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Garcia, Alfredo (October 5th, 1970) 'Behind Salvador Allende's Electoral Victory' *Intercontinental Press* 8(32): 821-827

Gardner, Simon (September 22nd, 2015) 'Tories Have Forgotten that Thatcher Wasn't Just a Terrorist Sympathiser, but Close Friends with One' *The Independent* [online] URL: https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/tories-have-forgotten-that-thatcher-wasnt-just-a-terrorist-sympathiser-but-close-friends-with-one-10507850.html [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Garnett, Mark (2005) 'Planning for Power: 1964-1970' in Stuart Ball & Anthony Seldon (eds.) *Recovering Power: The Conservatives in Opposition since 1867* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Gathergood, John (2012) 'Debt and Depression: Causal Links and Social Norm Effects' *The Economic Journal* 122(563): 1094-1114

Gershkoff, Amy & Shana Kushner (2005) 'Shaping Public Opinion: The 9/11-Iraq Connection in the Bush Administration's Rhetoric *Perspectives on Politics* 3(3): 525-537

Giddens, Anthony (1994) *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics* Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, Anthony (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* Cambridge: Polity

Gilbert, Jeremy (2007) 'All the Right Questions, All the Wrong Answers' in Paul Bowman & Richard Stamp (eds.) *The Truth of Žižek* London: Continuum: 61-81

Gill, Stephen (1998) 'New Constitutionalism, Democratisation and Global Political Economy' *Global Change, Peace & Security* 10(1): 23-28

Gill, Stephen & Claire A. Cutler (2014) 'New Constitutionalism and World Order: General Introduction' in Stephen Gill & Claire A. Cutler (eds.) *New Constitutionalism and World Order* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-21

Glynos, Jason & David Howarth (2007) *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Theory* London: Routledge

Glynos, Jason et al (2009) 'Discourse Analysis: Varieties and Methods' *ESRC National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper,* Economic & Social Research Council: 1-41

Goigovic Donoso, Igor (2015) 'The Development of the Popular Movement and Rise of the Revolutionary Left in Chile (1953-1978)' *Tempo e Argumento* 7(16): 329-352

González, Francisco (2008) *Dual Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Institutionalized Regimes in Chile and Mexico, 1970-2000* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press

Gonzalez, Mike (1984) 'The Left and the Coup in Chile' *International Socialism* 2(22): 45-86

Graham, Cameron & Dean Neu (2004) 'Standardized Testing and the Construction of Governable Persons' *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36(3): 295-319

Gramsci, Antonio (1992) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* New York City, NY: International Publishers

Gray, John (2004) 'Blair's Project in Retrospect' *International Affairs* 80(1): 39-48

Greenslade, Roy (March 2nd, 2011) 'Another Murdoch joins the Times board – with a retired spy' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/media/greenslade/2011/mar/02/rupert-murdoch-thetimes [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Griffin, Roger (1993) *The Nature of Fascism* London: Routledge

Grugel, Jean (1985) 'Nationalist Movements and Fascist Ideology in Chile' *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 4(2): 109-122

The Guardian (May 12th, 1997) 'Robin Cook's Speech on the Government's Ethical Foreign Policy' [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/world/1997/may/12/indonesia.ethicalforeignpolicy [date last accessed: 07/03/2019]

Guardiola-Rivera, Oscar (2013) *Story of a Death Foretold: The Coup against Salvador Allende, 11 September 1973* London: Bloomsbury

Hale, Sarah et al. (2004) *The 'Third Way' and Beyond: Criticisms, Futures and Alternatives* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Hannick, Paul (September 6th, 1985) 'Chile Coup: 12 Years On' *Militant*: 8-9

Harman, Chris (March 31st 1973) 'How ITT Tried to Beat Allende' *Socialist Worker*: 4

Harmer, Tanya (2011) *Allende's Chile and the Inter-American Cold War* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press

Harris, Reginald (December 2016) *Monthly Labor Review*: 1-17

Harrison, Graham (2005) 'Imperialism' in Georgina Blakeley & Valerie Bryson (eds.) *Marx and Other Four Letter Words* London: Pluto Press: 81-95

Harvey, David (2007) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Harvey, David (2010) *A Companion to Marx's Capital* London: Verso

Harvey, Fiona (September 12th, 2019) 'World losing area of forest the size of the UK each year, report finds' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/sep/12/deforestation-world-losing-area-forest-size-of-uk-each-year-report-finds [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Harvey, Robert (February 2nd, 1980) 'Chile's Counter-Revolution: A Survey' *The Economist*

Hay, Colin (2009) 'The Winter of Discontent Thirty Years On' *The Political Quarterly* 80(4): 545-552

Haynes, Mike (1988) 'Nightmares of the Market: Chile, Yugoslavia and Hungary' *International Socialism* 2(41): 3-44

Hayek, Friedrich (1960) *The Constitution of Liberty* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Haynes, Mike (1988) 'Nightmares of the Market: Chile, Yugoslavia and Hungary' *International Socialism* 2(41): 3-44

Hearse, Phil (September 11th, 1980) 'Chile – How the Revolution was Lost' *Socialist Challenge*: 8-9

Heath, Anthony F. et al. (2001) *The Rise of New Labour: Party Policies and Voter Choices* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hencke, David & Francis Beckett (2009) *Marching to the Fault Line: The 1984 Miners' Strike and the Death of Industrial Britain* London: Constable & Robinson

Hickson, Kevin (2004) 'The Postwar Consensus Revisited' *Rethinking Democracy* 75(2): 142-154

Higgs, Kerryn (2014) *Collision Course: Endless Growth on a Finite Planet* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Hill, Philip (1999) *Lacan for Beginners* Danbury, CT: For Beginners

Hinton, James (1983) *Labour and Socialism: A History of the British Labour Movement, 1867-1974* Brighton: Harvester Press

Hira, Anil (1998) *Ideas and Economic Policy in Latin America: Regional, National and Organisational Case Studies* Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publishers

Hoare, George & Nathan Sperber (2015) *An Introduction to Antonio Gramsci: His Life, Thought and Legacy* London: Bloomsbury

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (October 1974) 'The Labour Movement and Military Coups' *Marxism Today*: 302-308

Holden, Emily et al (December 10th, 2019) 'Firm knew about lead in Flint's water but didn't warn public, emails show' *MLive.com* [online] URL: https://www.mlive.com/news/flint/2019/12/firm-knew-about-lead-in-flints-water-but-didnt-warn-public-emails-show.html [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Holmes, Martin (1997) *The Failure of the Heath Government* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Hostettler, John (December 1973) 'Trends in Authoritarian Rule in Britain' *Marxism Today*: 356-362

Howard, Michael Charles & John Edward King (1992) *A History of Marxian Economics, Volume II: 1929-1990* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Howarth, David (1998) 'Discourse Theory and Political Analysis' in Scarborough, Elinor & Eric Tanenbaum *Research Strategies in the Social Sciences: A Guide to New Approaches* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 268-293

Howe, Mark (2001) *Is that Damned Paper Still Coming Out? The Very Best of the Daily Worker/Morning Star, 1930-2000* London: People's Printing Press

Hughes, Jerry (September 25th, 1980) 'Pinochet Isolated Except from Britain' *Socialist Challenge*: 10

Huneeus, Carlos (2003) 'A Highly Institutionalized Political Party: Christian Democracy in Chile' in Scott Mainwaring & Timothy R. Scully (eds.) *Christian Democracy in Latin America: Electoral Competition and Regime Conflcits* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Hussain, Anwar (December 25th, 2019) 'Ship-breaking Industry: Minimum Wage Still a Far Cry' *Dhaka Tribune* [online] URL: https://www.dhakatribune.com/business/2019/12/25/ship-breaking-industry-minimum-wage-still-a-far-cry [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Ikeda, Sanford (1997) *Dynamics of the Mixed Economy: Toward a Theory of Interventionism* London: Routledge

inequality.org (n.d.) 'Global Inequality' [online] URL: https://inequality.org/facts/global-inequality/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Intercontinental Press (January 25th, 1971) 'The Real Perspective Facing the Masses' 9(3): 62-64

Intercontinental Press (May 14th, 1973) 'Right Wing Launches New Offensive' 11(18): 559-560

Intercontinental Press (June 25th, 1973) 'Copper Workers Strike in Second Month' 11(24): 765

Intercontinental Press (September 24th, 1973) 'How U.S. Tightened Economic Screws on Allende' 11(33): 1055-1056

Intercontinental Press (October 8th, 1973) 'Eyewitness Account of Repression in Chile' 11(35): 1107-1111

Irish Independent (July 29th, 2012) 'Alastair Burnet' [online] URL: https://www.independent.ie/world-news/alastair-burnet-26880845.html [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Jedlicki, Claudio (2001) 'Arghiri Emmanuel' *Revue Tiers Monde* 42(168): 951-953

Jessop, Bob (2007) 'From Micro-powers to Governmentality: Foucault's Work on Statehood, State Formation, Statecraft and State Power' *Political Geography* 26: 34-40

Jobson, Richard & Mark Wickham-Jones (2011) 'Reinventing the Block Vote? Trade Unions and the 2010 Labour Party Leadership Election' *British Politics* 6(3): 317-344

Johnston, Adrian (2007) ') 'From the Spectacular Act to the Vanishing Act: Badiou, Žižek and the Politics of Lacanian Theory' in Heiko Feldner & Fabio Vighi (eds.) *Did Somebody Say Ideology? On Slavoj Žižek and Consequences* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 41:77

Kasrils, Chris & Brian Denny (October 31st, 1998) 'Bailed – But Still under Guard' *Morning Star*: 1

Kavanagh, Dennis (1987) *Thatcherism and British Politics: The End of Consensus?* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kavanagh, Dennis (1992) 'The Postwar Consensus' *Twentieth Century British History* 3(2): 175-190

Kellner, Douglas (2003) *From 9/11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Kellner, Douglas (2006) '9/11, Spectacles of Terror and Media Manipulation' *Critical Discourse Studies* 1(1): 41-64

Kelsen, Hans (2008) *Pure Theory of Law* Clark, NJ: The Lawbook Exchange

Kennedy, Warwick E. & Colin M. Murray (2012) 'Growing Apart? The Persistence of Inequality in Chile, 1964-2010' *Urbani Izziv* 23(2 Spec): 22-35

Kiernan, Victor (1990) 'Modern Capitalism and its Shepherds' *New Left Review* 1(183): 75-94

Kirshner, Lewis (2005) 'Rethinking Desire: The *Objet Petit A* in Lacanian Theory' *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 53(1): 83-102

Klein, Naomi (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* New York City, NY: Metropolitan Books

Koonings, Kees & Dirk Krujit (2002) *Political Armies: The Military and Nation Building in the Age of Democracy* London: Zed Books

Kopf, Dan (February 5th, 2019) 'Union membership in the US keeps on falling, like almost everywhere else' *Quartz* [online] URL: https://qz.com/1542019/union-membership-in-the-us-keeps-on-falling-like-almost-everywhere-else/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Kornbluh, Peter (2003) *The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability* New York City, NY: New Press

Kyaw-Mint, Su Mon & Lyndall Strazdins (2015) 'Occupational Stress' in Colin Butler et al (eds.) *Health of People, Places and Planet: Reflections Based on Tony McMichael's Four*

Decades of Contribution to Epidemiological Understanding' Canberra: ANU Press: 81-94

Lacan, Jacques (1990) *Television: A Challenge to the Psychoanalytic Establishment* New York City, NY: W. W. Norton & Company

Lacan, Jacques (2008) *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis: Book XVII* New York City, NY: W. W. Norton & Company

Laclau, Ernesto (1997) 'The Death and Resurrection of the Theory of Ideology' *MLN* 112(3): 297-321

Laclau, Ernesto (2006a) 'Ideology and Post-Marxism' *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2): 103-114

Laclau, Ernesto (2006b) 'Why Constructing a People is the Main Task of Radical Politics' *Critical Inquiry* 32(4): 646-680

Laclau, Ernesto & Chantal Mouffe (2001) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* London: Verso

Laybourn, Keith (2000) *A Century of Labour: A History of the Labour Party, 1900-2000* Stroud: Sutton Publishing

Laybourn, Keith (2006) *Marxism in Britain: Dissent, Decline and Re-emergence, 1945-c.2000* London: Routledge

Lenin, Vladimir I. (1974) *Lenin Collected Works, Volume 21* Progress Publishers: Moscow

Lenin, Vladimir I. (1987) *The Essential Works of Lenin: "What is to Be Done?" and Other Writings* New York City, NY: Dover Publications

Lenin, Vladimir I. (1999 [1917]) *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* Sydney: Resistance Books

Lerner, Sharon & Leana Hosea (May 20th, 2018) 'From Pittsburgh to Flint, the dire consequences of giving private companies responsibility for ailing public water systems' *The Intercept* [online] URL: https://theintercept.com/2018/05/20/pittsburgh-flint-veolia-privatization-public-water-systems-lead/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Lewis, Michael (2008) *Derrida and Lacan: Another Writing* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Lieberman, Sima (1995) *Growth and Crisis in the Spanish Economy, 1940-93* London: Routledge

Light, Bob & Micky Fenn (December 21st, 1974) 'How I Escaped the Junta' *Socialist Worker*: 8-9

Lin, Chun (1993) *The British New Left* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Little, Daniel (1986) *The Scientific Marx* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press

Llanos Reyes, Claudio (2011a) 'On the Theoretical Convergences in the Configuration of the Unidad Popular' *Estudos Ibero-Americanos* 37(1): 105-124

Llanos Reyes, Claudio (2011b) 'Concentrated History: Victories and Defeats of the Unidad Popular Government' *Historia Unisinos* 15(2): 228-242

Long, Gideon (September 9th, 2013) 'Chile Still Split over Gen Augusto Pinochet Legacy' *BBC News* [online] URL: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-24014501 [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Loveman, Brian (Winter 1986-1987) 'Military Dictatorship and Political Opposition in Chile, 1973-1986' *Journal of Interamerican Studies* 28(4): 1-38

Lowe, Rodney (1990) 'The Second World War, Consensus and the Foundation of the Welfare State' *Twentieth Century British History* 1(2): 152-182

Luke, Allan (2002) 'Beyond Science and Ideological Critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis' *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22: 96-110

Luna, Juan Pablo et al (2013) 'Religious Parties in Chile: The Christian Democratic Party and the Independent Democratic Union' *Democratization* 20(5): 917-938

Luna, Juan Pablo & Rodrigo Mardones (2010) 'Chile: Are the Parties Over?' *Journal of Democracy* 21(3): 107-121

Luxemburg, Rosa (2003 [1913]) *The Accumulation of Capital* London: Routledge

Madra, Yahya M. & Fikret Adaman (2018) 'Neoliberal Turn in the Discipline of Economics: Depoliticisation Through Economisation' in Damien Cahill et al. (eds.) *SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* London: SAGE Publications: 113-128

Marsh, David et al. (1999) 'The Postwar Consensus: A Woozle that Wasn't?' in D. Marsh et al. *Postwar British Politics in Perspective* Cambridge: Polity: 66-86

Marx, Karl (2006) *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* Salt Lake City, UT: Project Gutenburg

Marx, Karl (2012) *Das Kapital* New York City, NY: Seedbox Press

May, Christopher (2014) 'The Rule of Law as the *Grundnorm* of the New Constitutionalism' in Stephen Gill & Claire A. Cutler (eds.) *New Constitutionalism and World Order* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 63-75

McGee Deutsch, Sandra (2009) 'Fascism, Neo-Fascism or Post-Fascism? Chile, 1945-1988' *Diálogos* 13(1): 19-44

McGowan, Todd (2004) *The End of Dissatisfaction? Jacques Lacan and the Emerging Society of Enjoyment* New York City, NY: State University of New York Press

McGowan, Todd (2016) *Capitalism and Desire: The Psychic Cost of Free Markets* New York City, NY: Columbia University Press

McMichael, Philip et al. (1974) 'Imperialism and the Contradictions of Development' *New Left Review* 1(85): 83-104

McMillan, Chris (2008) 'Symptomatic Readings: Žižekian Theory as Discursive Strategy' *International Journal of Žižek Studies* 2(1): 1-22

Medena, Eden (2006) 'Designing Freedom, Regulating a Nation: Socialist Cybernetics in Allende's Chile' *Journal of Latin American Studies* 38: 571-606

Meeropol, Michael (1998) *Surrender: How the Clinton Administration Completed the Reagan Revolution* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press

Merchant, Brian (June 18th, 2017) 'Life and Death in Apple's Forbidden City' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jun/18/foxconn-life-death-forbidden-city-longhua-suicide-apple-iphone-brian-merchant-one-device-extract [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Mihic, Sophia Jane (2008) 'Neoliberalism and the Jurisprudence of Privacy: An Experiment in Feminist Theorizing' *Feminist Theory* 9(2): 165-184

Militant (September 14th, 1973) 'Army Seize Power in Chile': 1, 8

Militant (July 13th, 1979) 'Chile: New Generation Enters Struggle' *Militant*: 10-11

Militant (July 25th, 1980) 'Chile: Military "Democracy"': 10

Militant (February 1st, 1985) 'Revolution in Chile': 8-9

Milovanovic, Dragan (2003) 'Introduction to the Transaction Edition' in Evgeny Pashukanis *The General Theory of Law & Marxism* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers: vii-xxvi

Mirowski, Philip & Dieter Plehwe (eds.) (2009) *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Morning Star (September 4th, 1970) 'Left's United Bid in Chile Election': 4

Morning Star (September 14th, 1973) 'Nixon's Hand in Chile Rebellion': 1

Morning Star (September 18th, 1973) 'TGWU Urges "Boycott Junta"': 1

Morning Star (September 21st, 1973) 'Chile Junta Welcome for US Monopolies': 1

Morning Star (March 13th, 1990) 'Aylwin Hails Chile's Return to Democracy': 2

Mudge, Stephanie Lee (2011) 'What's Left of Leftism? Neoliberal Politics in Western Party Systems, 1945-2004' *Social Science History* 35(3): 337-380

Muir, Richard & Alan Angell (2005) 'Commentary: Salvador Allende: His Role in Chilean Politics' *International Journal of Epidemiology* 34(4): 737-739

Muñoz, Heraldo (2008) *The Dictator's Shadow: Life Under Augusto Pinochet* New York City, NY: Basic Books

Murphy, Fred (October 15th, 1984) 'New Wave of Anti-Pinochet Actions' *Intercontinental Press* 22(19): 596-597

Nef, Jorge (2003) 'The Chilean Model: Fact and Fiction' *Latin American Perspectives* 30(5): 16-40

Negri, Camilo (2012) 'The Challenges of Implementing the Chilean Way to Socialism: Impact Analyses of Three Economic Proposals' *Historia Unisinos* 16(1): 55-68

Newman, Otto & Richard De Zoysa (2001) *The Promise of the Third Way: Globalisation and Social Justice* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Newman, Saul (2001) *From Bakunin to Lacan: Anti-Authoritarianism and the Dislocation of Power* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books

Nolan, Dieter (2005) *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook, Volume 2: South America* Oxford: Oxford University Press

O'Carroll, Lisa (September 13th, 2013) 'Rupert Murdoch names Andrew Knight as Times Newspapers Chairman' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2012/sep/13/andrew-knight-times-newspapers-chairman [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

O'Connor, Sarah (February 23rd, 2018) 'Millennials poorer than previous generations, data show' *Financial Times* [online] URL: https://www.ft.com/content/81343d9e-187b-11e8-9e9c-25c814761640 [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

O'Hara, Mary (2017) 'Mental Health and Suicide' in Vickie Cooper & David Whyte (eds.) *The Violence of Austerity* London: Pluto Press: 35-43

Olivier, Bert (2009) 'Lacan on the Discourse of Capitalism: Critical Prospects' *Phronimon* 10(1): 25-42

Olssen, Mark & Michael A. Peters (2007) 'Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism' *Journal of Education Policy* 20(3): 313-345

Osvald, Sunkel & Stephany Griffith Jones (1986) *Debt and Development Crises in Latin America: The End of an Illusion* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Özselçuk, Ceren & Yahya Madra (2007) 'Economy, Surplus, Politics: Some Questions on Slavoj Žižek's Political Economy Critique of Capitalism' in Heiko Feldner & Fabio Vighi (eds.) *Did Somebody Say Ideology? On Slavoj Žižek and Consequences* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 78-107

Palley, Thomas (2005) 'From Keynesianism to Neoliberalism: Shifting Paradigms' in Alfredo Saad-Filho & Deborah Johnston (eds.) *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader* London: Pluto Press: 20-29

Palmgren, Lars (October 20th, 1980) 'Mass Movement Reviving in Chile' *Intercontinental Press* 18(39): 1072-1073

Parker, Ian (2005) 'Lacanian Discourse Analysis in Psychology' *Theory & Psychology* 15(2): 163-182

Pasca, Romana & Shannon Wagner (2012) 'Occupational Stress, Mental Health, and Satisfaction in the Canadian Multicultural Workplace' *Social Indicators Research* 109(3): 377-393

Pashukanis, Evgeny (1978) *Law and Marxism: A General Theory* London: Ink Links

Paterson, Harry (2014) *Look Back in Anger: The Miners' Strike in Nottinghamshire – 30 Years on* Nottingham: Five Leaves Publications

Perchard, Andrew (2013) '"Broken Men" and "Thatcher's Children": Memory and Legacy in Scotland's Coalfields' *International Labor and Working-Class History* 84: 78-98

Phillips, Jim (2006) 'The 1972 Miners' Strike: Popular Agency and Industrial Politics in Britain' *Contemporary British History* 20(2): 187-207

Phythian, Mark (2007) *The Labour Party, War and International Relations, 1945-2006* London: Routledge

Pickard, John (July 6th, 1973) 'Chile: Arm Workers to Avert Catastrophe' *Militant*: 6

Ponsford, Dominic (June 13th, 2014) 'Seriously Popular: The Economist now claims to reach 5.3m readers a week in print and online' *Press Gazette* [online] URL: https://www.pressgazette.co.uk/seriously-popular-economist-now-claims-reach-53m-readers-week-print-and-online [date last accessed: 25/01/2019]

Power, Margaret (2002) *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle Against Allende, 1964-1973* University Park, PA: Penn State University Press

Pozzolini, Alberto (1970) *Antonio Gramsci: An Introduction to His Thought* London: Pluto Press

Pring, John (February 7th, 2019) '"Shocking" PIP death figures "show assessment process is unfit for purpose"' *Disability News Service* [online] URL: https://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/shocking-pip-death-figures-show-assessment-process-is-unfit-for-purpose/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Qureshi, Lubna (2009) *Nixon, Kissinger and Allende: U.S. Involvement in the 1973 Coup in Chile* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books

Radzinski, A (1985) 'Lacan/Saussure: Les Contours Théoriques d'une Rencontre' *Langage* 77: 117-124

Read, Jason (2009) 'A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity' *Foucault Studies* 6: 25-36

Red Mole (February 1st-15th 1971) 'Chile: A Doomed "Popular Front"': 9

Red Weekly (August 17th, 1973) 'End of the Chilean Road': 7

Robinson, Ann & Cedric Sandford (1983) *Tax Policy-Making in the United Kingdom: A Study of Rationality, Ideology and Politics* London: Heinemann Educational

Red Mole (February 1st-15th, 1971) 'Chile: A Doomed "Popular Front"': 9

Red Weekly (August 17th, 1973) 'End of the Chilean Road': 7

'Reforma Constitucional que Introduce Diversas Modificaciones a la Constitución Política de la República' (2005) *Constitución de 1980*. Chile.

Reitan, Earl A. (2003) *The Thatcher Revolution: Margaret Thatcher, John Major, Tony Blair and the Transformation of Modern Britain, 1979-2001* London: Rowman & Littlefield

Reyes, Claudio Llanos (2011) 'Concentrated History: Victories and Defeats of the Unidad Popular Government' *Historia Unisinos* 15(2): 228-242

Reynolds, Simon (January 18th, 2017) 'Mark Fisher's K-punk blogs were required reading for a generation' *The Guardian* [online] URL:

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jan/18/mark-fisher-k-punk-blogs-did-48-politics [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Ribeiro de Meneses, Filipe (2010) *Salazar: A Political Biography* New York City, NY: Enigma Books

Richards, Michael (2002) 'From War Culture to Civil Society: Francoism, Social Change and Memories of the Spanish Civil War' *History and Memory* 14(1-2): 93-120

Richards, I. A. (1966) *Plato's Republic* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, Vic (July 7th, 1973) 'Army Fails in Bid to Topple Allende' *Socialist Worker*: 4

Riesco, Manuel (1999) 'Chile, a Quarter of a Century on' *New Left Review* 1(238): 97-1256

Rios, J. (1972) 'Chile: The Time for Decision' *International Socialism* 1(53): 5-8

Roizen, Michael & Keith Roach (2010) 'Wellbeing in the Workplace' *British Medical Journal* 340(7757): 1150-1151

Ross, John (February 15th, 1979) 'Iran and Chile – More than an Ocean Apart' *Socialist Challenge*: 5

Roxborough, Ian & Vic Richards (May 19th, 1973) 'Chile: Worker Killed as the Calm Breaks' *Socialist Worker*: 4

Ruiz, Julius (2005) *Franco's Justice: Repression in Madrid after the Spanish Civil War* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Russell, Sam (September 27th, 1973) 'How the Rich Rejoiced at Chile' *Morning Star*: 3

Rutland, Peter (2013) 'Neoliberalism and the Russian Transition' *Review of International Political Economy* 20(2): 332-362

Salecl, Renata (1994) *The Spoils of Freedom: Psychoanalysis and Feminism after the Fall of Socialism* London: Routledge

Shapiro, Ian (2002) 'Problems, Methods and Theories in the Study of Politics, or, What's Wrong with Political Science and What to do About it' *Political Theory* 30(4): 596-619

Sharpe, Matthew (2005) 'What's *Left* in Žižek? The Antimonies of Žižek's Sociopolitical Reason' in Geoff Boucher et al (eds.) *Traversing the Fantasy: Critical Responses to Slavoj Žižek* Aldershot: Ashgate: 147-168

Shaw, Eric (2007) *Losing Labour's Soul? New Labour and the Blair Government, 1997-2007* London: Routledge

Siddique, Haroon (March 27th, 2014) 'Atos quits £500m work capability assessment contract early' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/mar/27/atos-quite-work-capability-assessment-contract-early [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Sigmund, Paul E. (1977) *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile, 1964-1976* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press

Silva, Patricio (2009) *In the Name of Reason: Technocrats and Politics in Chile* Pennsylvania, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press

Silva Solar, Julio (2008) '¿Era Viable el Proyecto de la Unidad Popular?' in Miguel Soto Lawner & Jacobo Hernán Schatan (eds.) *Salvador Allende: Presencia en la Ausencia* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones

Silverman, Roger (September 21st, 1973) 'Chile: Lessons of the Coup' *Militant*: 4-5

Silverman, Roger (September 28th, 1973) 'Chile: Warning to British Workers' *Militant*: 2, 7

Sloman, Peter (2016) '"The Pragmatist's Solution to Poverty": The Heath Government's Tax Credit Scheme and the Politics of Social Policy in the 1970s' *Twentieth Century British History* 27(2): 220-241

Sloterdijk, Peter (2008) *The Critique of Cynical Reason* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press

Smith, Evan & Matthew Worley (2014) 'Introduction: The Far Left in Britain from 1956' in *ibid.* (eds.) *Against the Grain: the British Far Left from 1956* Manchester: Manchester University Press: 1-23

Smith, Evan & Matthew Worley (eds.) (2014) *Against the Grain: the British Far Left from 1956* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Smith, William C. et al. (1994) *Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives for the 1990s* Miami, FL: The University of Miami North-South Center

Socialist Worker (June 2nd, 1973) '[The right wing press in Chile]' *Socialist Worker*: 4

Socialist Worker (September 14th, 1991) 'They Call This Democracy': 8-9

Socialist Worker (December 5th, 1998) 'Forced Handover': 9

Socialist Worker (December 5th, 1998) 'Workers Must Smash Old Order': 10

Spence, Joe (1995) 'Review: The Pursuit of Reason: The Economist, 1843-1993 by Ruth Dudley Edwards' *Irish Historical Studies* 29(116): 624-626

Spencer, David A. (2000) 'The Demise of Radical Political Economics? An Essay on the Evolution of a Theory of Capitalist Production' *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 5(1): 543-564

Springer, Simon (2012) 'Neoliberalism as Discourse: Between Foucauldian Political Economy and Marxian Poststructuralism' *Critical Discourse Studies* 9(2): 133-147

Stauffer, Devin (2006) *The Unity of Plato's 'Gorgias' Rhetoric, Justice and the Philosophic Life* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Stavrakakis, Yannis (1999) *Lacan and the Political* London: Routledge

Stavrakakis, Yannis (2007) *The Lacanian Left: Psychoanalysis, Theory, Politics* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Stedman Jones, Daniel (2012) *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Steele, Gerald R. (2010) 'Inflation Economics: The Heath-Barber Boom, 1972-74' *Economic Affairs* 30(3): 79-81

Steenland, Kyle (1974) 'Rural Strategy under Allende' *Latin American Perspectives* 1(2): 129-146

Studlar, Donley (2007) 'From Collectivist Consensus to 21st Century Neoliberalism: Orders and Eras in Postwar Britain' *The Forum* 5(3)

Taaffe, Peter & Tony Mulhearn (2017) *Liverpool: A City that Dared to Fight* London: Socialist Books

Tapping, Alexandra (June 1st, 2017) 'Union membership has plunged to an all-time low, says DBEIS' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2017/jun/01/union-membership-has-plunged-to-an-all-time-low-says-ons [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Taylor, Andrew (2005) *The NUM and British Politics, Volume 2: 1969-1995* London: Routledge

Taylor, Diana (2009) 'Normativity and Normalization' *Foucault Studies* 7: 45-63

Taylor, Robert (2013) 'The Heath Government and Industrial Relations: Myth and Reality' in Stuart Ball & Anthony Seldon (eds.) *The Heath Government, 1970-74: A Reappraisal* London: Routledge

Teghtsoonian, Katherine (2008) 'Managing Workplace Depression: Contesting the Contours of Emerging Policy in the Workplace' in Pamela Moss & Katherine Teghtsoonian (eds.) *Contesting Illness: Process and Practices* Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 69-89

Therborn, Göran (1979) 'The Travail of Latin American Democracy' *New Left Review* 1(113-114): 71-109

Thomas, Gwynn (2011) 'The Legacies of Patrimonial Patriarchalism: Contesting Political Legitimacy in Allende's Chile' *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 636(1): 69-87

Tomšič, Samo (2015) *The Capitalist Unconscious: Marx and Lacan* London: Verso

Valdés, Juan Gabriel (2008) *Pincohet's Economists: The Chicago School of Economics in Chile* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Vander Schee, Carolyn (2008) 'The Politics of Health as a School-Sponsored Ethic: Foucault, Neoliberalism and the Unhealthy Employee' *Educational Policy* 22(6): 854-874

Verdugo, Patricia (2004) *La Casa Blanca contra Salvador Allende* Madrid: Tabla Rasa

Vidal, John (December 2nd, 2017) '"This is the world's cheapest place to scrap ships" – but in Chittagong, it's the people who pay the price' *The Guardian* [online] URL: https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/dec/02/chittagong-shipbreaking-yards-legal-fight [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Vidal Molina, Paula (2014) 'Unidad Popular y la Lucha por la Igualdad Radical en Chile' *Izquierdas* 18: 74-93

Vincent, Andrew (2010) *Modern Political Ideologies* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell

von Mises, Ludwig (2009) *Planned Chaos* Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute

Vuskovic, Sergio (July 1971) 'Political Pluralism' *Marxism Today*: 199-203

Weiner, Tim (2007) *Legacy of Ashes: The History of the CIA* New York City, NY: Doubleday

Winslow, E. M. (1931) 'Marxian, Liberal and Sociological Theories of Imperialism' *The Journal of Political Economy* 39(6): 713-758

Wheeler, Nicholas J. & Tim Dunne (1998) 'Good International Citizenship: A Third Way for British Foreign Policy' *International Affairs* 75(4): 847-870

Whitehead, Laurence (1974) *The Lesson of Chile* London: The Fabian Society

Whitfield, David (December 11th, 1980) 'Pinochet Seeks to Impress World' *Morning Star*: 2

Widdowson, Henry (1998) 'The Theory and Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis' *Applied Linguistics* 19(1): 136-151

Wilson, Kalpana (2013) 'Agency as "Smart Economics": Neoliberalism, Gender and Development' in Sumi Madhok et al. (eds.) *Gender, Agency and Coercion* London: Palgrave Macmillan: 84-101

Woods, Alan (October 1st, 1971) 'Chile: Popular Front Leading to Disaster' *Militant*: 2-3

Woods, Alan (April 28th, 1984) 'Chile: After the Junta Collapses' *Militant*: 10-11

Worland, Justin (November 13th, 2019) 'Countries are Falling Far Short on Action to Tackle Climate Change as Fossil Fuel Use Increases, Says Energy Report' *Time* [online] URL: https://time.com/5726917/energy-demand-iea-report/ [date last accessed: 20/02/2020]

Wroe, Anne (2012) *The Economist Style Guide: 12th Edition* London: Economist Books

Wuerth, Ingrid (2012) 'Pinochet's Legacy Reassessed' *American Journal of International Law* 106(4): 731-768

Žižek, Slavoj (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (1993) *Tarrying with the Negative: Kant, Hegel and the Critique of Ideology* Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Žižek, Slavoj (1995) *Mapping Ideology* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (2001) *Repeating Lenin* Zagreb: Arkzin

Žižek, Slavoj (2002) *Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (ed.) (2004) *Revolution at the Gates: Žižek on Lenin, the 1917 Writings* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (2006a) *How to Read Lacan* London: Granta Books

Žižek, Slavoj (2006b) *The Parallax View* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Žižek, Slavoj (2006c) 'Schlagend aber nicht Treffend!' *Critical Inquiry* 33(1): 185-211

Žižek, Slavoj (2008a) *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (2008b) *The Plague of Fantasies* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (2008c) *In Defence of Lost Causes* London: Verso

Žižek, Slavoj (2014) *Event: A Philosophical Journey through a Concept* New York City, NY: Melville House Publishing

Žižek, Slavoj (ed.) (2017) *Lenin 2017: Remembering, Repeating, Working Through* London: Verso